

INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

IOC DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

DECISION

**REGARDING SARDAR HASANOV
BORN ON 12 MAY 1985, AZERBAIJAN, ATHLETE, WEIGHTLIFTING**

(Rule 59.2.1 of the Olympic Charter)

Pursuant to the Olympic Charter and, in particular, Rule 59.2.1 thereof, and pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXIX Olympiad in Beijing in 2008 (the “**Rules**”) and, in particular but without limitation, Articles 2, 5.1, 7.3.3, 8 and 9 thereof:

I. FACTS

1. Sardar HASANOV (hereinafter the “**Athlete**”), participated in the Games of the XXIX Olympiad in Beijing in 2008 (the “**2008 Olympic Games**”).
2. On 11 August 2008, the Athlete competed in the Men’s 62kg weightlifting event in which he did not finish.
3. On 3 August 2008, the Athlete was requested to provide a urine sample for a doping control. Such sample was identified with the number 1843664.
4. The A-Sample 1843664 was analysed during the 2008 Olympic Games by the WADA-accredited Laboratory in Beijing. Such analysis did not result in an adverse analytical finding at that time.
5. After the conclusion of the 2008 Olympic Games, all the samples collected upon the occasion of the 2008 Olympic Games were transferred to the WADA-accredited “Laboratoire suisse d’analyse du dopage” in Lausanne, Switzerland (“the **Lausanne Laboratory**”).
6. The A-Sample 1843664 was further transferred to the WADA-accredited Institute of Biochemistry – German Sport University Cologne, Am Sportpark Muengendorf, 50933 Köln, Germany (the “**Cologne Laboratory**”) in February 2009 for further analysis.
7. Such analysis, which was for a specific substance, did not result in an adverse analytical finding at the time. The A-Sample 1843664 was then kept in the Cologne Laboratory for long-term storage.
8. The corresponding B-Sample was kept in the Lausanne Laboratory for long-term storage.
9. The IOC decided to perform further analyses on samples collected during the 2008 Olympic Games. These additional analyses were notably performed with improved analytical methods using more sensitive equipment and/or searching for new metabolites in order to possibly detect Prohibited Substances which were not identified by the analysis performed at the time of the 2008 Olympic Games.
10. In accordance with the provisions of the applicable International Standards for Laboratories (the “**ISL**”), the IOC decided that the reanalysis process would be conducted as follows:

- An initial analysis was to be conducted on the remains of the A-samples
 - If such initial analysis resulted in the indication of the potential presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers (“Presumptive Adverse Analytical Finding” - PAAF), the full confirmation analysis process (double confirmation) was to be conducted on the B-Sample, which would be split for the occasion into a B1- and a B2 Sample (becoming thus the equivalent of a A- and B-Sample).
11. The decision to proceed based on split B-samples was made in principle for all the re-analysis.
 12. This choice was made in view of the fact that during the transfer of the samples from the Beijing laboratory to the Lausanne Laboratory, the A-Samples were not individually resealed nor transported in sealed containers.
 13. At that time, resealing of A-Samples (or transport in sealed containers) was not a requirement pursuant to the applicable ISL (2008).
 14. However, it was felt that the option to rely on the B-Sample constituted an additional precaution securing the strength and reliability of the analytical process.
 15. A similar precautionous approach was adopted with regard to the implementation of the analytical process and notably of its first phase (opening and splitting of the B-Sample into a B1- and B2-Sample, sealing of the B2-Sample and analysis of the B1-Sample).
 16. Pursuant to the ISL, the presence of the Athlete is not a requirement for such first phase of the B-Sample analysis.
 17. The IOC nevertheless decided, once again as a matter of principle, that, whenever this was practically possible, the Athlete would be offered the opportunity to attend the above described first phase of the B-sample procedure.
 18. The remains of the A-Sample of the Athlete were subject to initial analysis. Such analysis resulted in a Presumptive Adverse Analytical Finding (“**PAAF**”) as it indicated the potential presence of a Prohibited Substance: dehydrochloromethyltestosterone (turinabol).
 19. On 19 May 2016, the Athlete through his NOC was informed of the PAAF and of the possibility to attend the opening and splitting of the B-Sample into a B1- and B2-Sample, the sealing of the B2-Sample and the analysis of the B1-Sample.
 20. Neither the Athlete, the NOC nor the IF replied.
 21. It was decided by the IOC that the analysis of the B-Sample (B1 and B2 Samples) would also be performed by the Cologne Laboratory. The transfer of the B-Sample from the Lausanne Laboratory to the Cologne Laboratory occurred on 27 May 2016.
 22. On 6 June 2016, the IF provided the IOC with the contact information of the Athlete, in particular his postal address.
 23. On 17 June 2016, the IOC sent a correspondence by postal mail to the Athlete in which the Athlete was informed of the PAAF and of the possibility to attend the opening and splitting of the B-Sample into a B1- and B2-Sample, the sealing of the B2-Sample and the analysis of the B1-Sample.

24. On 20 June 2016, the Athlete sent his completed PAAF Notification Appendix to the IOC through his NOC, in which he indicated that he would not attend the opening, splitting of the B-Sample, the sealing of the B2-Sample and the analysis of the B1-Sample, neither personally nor through a representative.
25. On 21 June 2016, the IOC informed the Athlete, through his NOC, that the opening, splitting of the B-Sample, the sealing of the B2-Sample and the analysis of the B-Sample was scheduled to take place on 28 June 2016 at the Cologne Laboratory.
26. The opening and splitting of the B-Sample, the sealing of the B2-Sample occurred on 28 June 2016 at the Cologne Laboratory.
27. The Athlete did not attend the opening and splitting of the B-Sample and was not represented on this occasion.
28. As provided in the ISL, the opening and splitting was attended by an independent witness.
29. The results of the B1-Sample analysis were reported on 29 June 2016. These results establish the presence of the metabolites of a Prohibited Substance, namely dehydrochloromethyltestosterone (turinabol).
30. Such results constitute an Adverse Analytical Finding. They were reported to the IOC in accordance with article 7.2.1 of the Rules.
31. Further to the verifications set forth in Art. 7.2.2 of the Rules and in application of Art. 7.2.3 of the Rules, the IOC President, Mr Thomas Bach, was informed of the existence of the AAF and the essential details available concerning the case.
32. Pursuant to Art. 7.2.4 of the Rules, the IOC President set up a Disciplinary Commission, consisting in this case of:
 - Mr Denis Oswald (Chairman, Switzerland), who is a member of the IOC Legal Affairs Commission;
 - Mrs Gunilla Lindberg (Sweden)
 - Mr Ugur Erdener (Turkey)
33. On 4 July 2016, the IOC notified the Athlete through his NOC of the above-mentioned AAF and of the institution of disciplinary proceedings to be conducted by the Disciplinary Commission. The IOC also informed the Athlete of his right to request and attend the opening of the B2-Sample and its analysis, either in person and/or through a representative, which was scheduled to take place on 14 July 2016 at the Cologne Laboratory. The Athlete was finally informed of his right to request a copy of the laboratory documentation package.
34. On 8 July 2016, the Athlete through his NOC provided the IOC with his completed AAF Notification Appendix in which he indicated that he did not accept the Adverse Analytical Finding and requested the opening and analysis of the B2-Sample. He indicated that he would not attend the process, neither personally nor through a representative. He further requested a copy of the laboratory documentation package.
35. On 2 August 2016, the IOC informed the Athlete that the opening of the B2-Sample had been postponed for organisational reasons and had been rescheduled to take place on 16 August 2016 at the Cologne Laboratory followed by the analysis of the sample over the following days.

36. The opening of the B2-Sample occurred on 16 August 2016 in the presence of an independent witness followed by the analysis.
37. The results of the B2-Sample analysis were reported to the IOC on 17 August 2016. They confirmed the presence in the B2-Sample of the metabolites of a Prohibited Substance, namely dehydrochloromethyltestosterone (turinabol).
38. On 31 August 2016, the IOC communicated to the Athlete the results of the B2-Sample analysis. The Athlete was invited to indicate whether he accepted the Adverse Analytical Finding, whether he would attend the hearing of the Disciplinary Commission and/or he would submit a defence in writing. The Athlete was also informed of his right to request a copy of the laboratory documentation package.
39. On the same day, the Athlete sent to the IOC through his NOC his completed Disciplinary Commission Form in which he indicated that he did not accept the Adverse Analytical Finding and requested a copy of the B2-Sample laboratory documentation package. He also indicated that he would not attend the hearing of the Disciplinary Commission, neither personally nor through a representative, and that he would not present his defence in writing.
40. On 6 September 2016, the IOC acknowledged receipt of the completed Disciplinary Commission Form and provided the Athlete with a copy of the A-, B1- and B2-Sample laboratory documentation packages. The IOC also provided the Athlete with additional documentation related to his sample, in particular the handling of the sample in Beijing and its transfer to the WADA accredited laboratory in Lausanne.
41. On 27 September 2016, the IOC informed the NOC and the IF that the Disciplinary Commission would issue a decision on the basis of the file. They were invited to file written observations by 12 October 2016.
42. The NOC and the IF did not reply.

II. APPLICABLE RULES

43. These proceedings are conducted in application of the Rules.
44. Art. 2.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“The presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete’s bodily Specimen.

- 2.1.1 *It is each Athlete’s personal duty to ensure that no Prohibited Substance enters his or her body. Athletes are responsible for any Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers found to be present in their bodily Specimens. Accordingly, it is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing Use on the Athlete’s part be demonstrated in order to establish an anti-doping violation under Article 2.1.*
- 2.1.2 *Excepting those substances for which a quantitative reporting threshold is specifically identified in the Prohibited List, the detected presence of any quantity of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete’s Sample shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation.*

2.1.3 *As an exception to the general rule of Article 2.1, the Prohibited List may establish special criteria for the evaluation of Prohibited Substances that can also be produced endogenously.”*

45. Art. 2.2 of the Rules provides as follows:

“Use or Attempted Use of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method

2.2.1 The success or failure of the Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method is not material. It is sufficient that the Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method was Used or Attempted to be used for an anti-doping rule violation to be committed.”

46. Art. 5.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“The IOC is responsible for Doping Control during the Period of the Olympic Games. The IOC is entitled to delegate all or part of its responsibility for Doping Control to one or several other organisations.

The Period of the Olympic Games, or In-Competition Period, is defined as “the period commencing on the date of the opening of the Olympic village for the Olympic Games, namely, 27 July 2008 up until and including the day of the closing ceremony of the Olympic Games, namely, 24 August 2008.

All Athletes participating at the Olympic Games shall be subject, during the Period of the Olympic Games, to Doping Control initiated by the IOC at any time or place, with No Advance Notice. Such Doping Control may include Testing for all Prohibited Substances and all Prohibited Methods referred to in the Prohibited List.

The IOC shall have the right to conduct or cause to conduct Doping Control during the Period of the Olympic Games, and is responsible for the subsequent handling of such cases.”

47. Art. 7.3.3 of the Rules provides as follows:

“Notice to an Athlete or other Person who has been accredited pursuant to the request of the NOC, may be accomplished by delivery of the notice to the NOC. Notification to the Chef de Mission or the President or the General Secretary of the NOC of the Athlete or other Person shall be deemed to be a delivery of notice to the NOC.”

48. Art. 8.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“A violation of these Rules in connection with Doping Control automatically leads to Disqualification of the Athlete with all other consequences, including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes.”

49. Art. 9.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“An Anti-Doping Rule violation occurring during or in connection with the Olympic Games may lead to Disqualification of all of the Athlete’s results obtained in the Olympic Games with all consequences, including forfeiture of all medals, points and prizes, except as provided in Article 9.1.1.”

50. Art. 9.1.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“If the Athlete establishes that he or she bears No Fault or Negligence for the violation, the Athlete’s results in the other Competition shall not be Disqualified unless the Athlete’s

results in Competitions other than the Competition in which the anti-doping rule violation occurred were likely to have been affected by the Athlete's anti-doping rule violation".

51. Art. 9.3 of the Rules provides as follows:

"The management of anti-doping rule violations and the conduct of additional hearings as a consequence of hearings and decisions of the IOC, including with regard to the imposition of sanctions over and above those relating to the Olympic Games, shall be managed by the relevant International Federation".

III. DISCUSSION

52. The presence of metabolites of a Prohibited Substance, i.e. dehydrochloromethyltestosterone (turinabol), has been established in 2016 in the sample 1843664 that the Athlete provided on 3 August 2008, upon the occasion of the 2008 Olympic Games.
53. The substance detected in the Athlete's sample is an anabolic steroid. It is listed in the WADA 2008 Prohibited List and in all subsequent lists.
54. The Disciplinary Commission is satisfied that the sample which has been re-analysed by the Cologne Laboratory is unequivocally linked to the Athlete and that no relevant departure from the WADA International Standards occurred.
55. Whilst the Athlete states that he does not accept the analytical results, he does not bring forth any element, which could put the validity of the results in question.
56. The Disciplinary Commission thus finds that the Athlete has in any event committed an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to Art. 2.1 of the Rules consisting in the presence of a Prohibited Substance in his body.
57. In addition, the Disciplinary Commission finds that an anti-doping rule violation would also be established if the circumstances are considered in the perspective of art. 2.2 of the Rules.
58. The Disciplinary Commission observes that the nature of the substance which was found in the Athlete's sample is consistent with intentional use of Prohibited Substances specifically ingested to deliberately improve performance. The fact that metabolite of a doping substance, which is a "classical" doping substance was found, supports this consideration.
59. The consequences of an anti-doping rule violation under the Rules are limited to consequences in connection with the 2008 Olympic Games. They are set forth in Art. 8 and 9 of the Rules and are the following.
60. In application of Art. 8.1 and/or Art. 9 of the Rules, all results achieved by the Athlete during the 2008 Olympic Games shall be annulled. This includes the result that the Athlete did not finish.
61. In application of Art. 9.3 of the Rules, the further management of the consequences of the anti-doping rule violations and in particular the imposition of sanctions over and above those related to the Olympic Games 2008 shall be conducted by the International Weightlifting Federation ("**IWF**").

* * * * *

CONSIDERING the above, pursuant to the Olympic Charter and, in particular, Rule 59.2.1 thereof, and pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXIX Olympiad in Beijing in 2008 and, in particular, 2, 5.1, 7.3.3, 8 and 9 thereof.

THE DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE
DECIDES

- I. The Athlete, Sardar HASANOV:
 - (i) is found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXIX Olympiad in Beijing in 2008 (presence and/or use, of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an athlete's bodily specimen),
 - (ii) is disqualified from the Men's 62kg weightlifting event in which he participated upon the occasion of the Olympic Games Beijing 2008.
- II. The IWF is requested to modify the results of the above-mentioned event accordingly and to consider any further action within its own competence.
- III. This decision enters into force immediately.

Lausanne, 19 October 2016

In the name of the IOC Disciplinary Commission



Denis Oswald, Chairman



Gunilla Lindberg



Ugur Erdener