



UIPM DOPING REVIEW PANEL 01/21

To:

Mr. Danil Kalimullin
c/o Lisin Mishin & Partners
Nizhny Susalny Per 5/19
Delovoy Office Centre,
05064 Moscow
Russia

In copy to: RUSADA, RMPF

Patron:

His Majesty
King Constantine

Honorary President:

His Serene Highness
Prince Albert II of Monaco

Headquarters:

Stade Louis II – Entrée C
19 avenue des Castelans
MC-98000 Monaco

Tel.: +377 97 77 85 55

Fax: +377 97 77 85 50

Mail: uipm@pentathlon.org

Website : www.pentathlon.org

Decision of the UIPM Doping Review Panel regarding

MR. DANIL KALIMULLIN

1. THE PARTIES

1.1. UNION INTERNATIONALE DE PENTATHLON MODERNE (“UIPM”), an Association governed by Monegasque Law and formed under Law 1355 of 23 December 2009, is the world governing body for the sport of Modern Pentathlon a multi-disciplinary sport comprising fencing, swimming, horse riding, shooting and running or any combination thereof. UIPM has its headquarters in the city of Monaco. According to § 3.2 of its Statute, among other things the role of UIPM is “*promote integrity, ethics and fair-play in the sport of Modern Pentathlon and constituent sports preventing the use and diffusion of any kind of doping*”. To pursue this goal, UIPM has implemented, in accordance with UIPM’s responsibility under the World Anti-doping Code, the UIPM Anti-Doping Rules.

1.1.1. UIPM is represented by Ms. Fulvia Lucantonio, UIPM Legal Counsel;

1.2. MR. DANIL KALIMULLIN, born in the Russian Federation, on 9 July 1992, is a Modern Pentathlon athlete (the “**Athlete**”);

1.2.1. The Athlete is affiliated with Russian Modern Pentathlon Federation, a National Federation member of UIPM.

1.2.2. The Athlete is represented by:

- (a) Mr. Sergei Revovich Lisin, a Russian citizen, born on 12 December 1978; and
- (b) Mr. Sergei Anatolyevich Mishin, a Russian citizen, born on 1 February 1974.



2. FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

2.1. The elements set out below are a summary of the main relevant facts as established by the UIPM Doping Review Panel (“**Panel**”) by way of a chronology on the basis of the submissions of the parties. Additional facts may be set out, where relevant, in the other chapters of the present award.

2.2. Save as otherwise provided below, terms with capitalized letters shall have the same

meaning attributed to them in the UIPM Anti-Doping Rules (“**UIPM Rules**”).

Section I – Analysis and notification to the Athlete

2.3. The athlete is competing in Modern Pentathlon and has UIPM International license. He won Russian CUP in February 2021. He was a member of team relay on UIPM Pentathlon World Championships in seasons 2017 and 2019. His best individual result on International competition is 8th place UIPM World CUP 1 in Los Angeles 2017.

2.4. On 27 February 2021, the Athlete provided sample number 3155050 in occasion of Out of Competition testing (“**Sample**”). In such circumstance, the Athlete declared to have taken the following medication\supplement in the previous 7 (seven) days (without disclosing timing and dosage):

2.4.1. Gipoksen;

2.4.2. OptigenHP;

2.4.3. Detrimax.

2.5. The testing authority was UIPM, Sample collection authority was International Doping Tests & Management Agency (IDTM).

2.6. The Sample was analysed by the WADA accredited laboratory in Cologne, Germany. The Laboratory analysed the A Sample in accordance with the procedures set out in WADA’s International Standard for Laboratories.

2.7. The laboratory analysis revealed the presence of SARMS LGD-4033 (ligandrol) metabolite LGD – 4033 bishydroxy-metabolite (“**Metabolite**”).

2.8. The Metabolite is a Prohibited Substance listed in the WADA Prohibited List under Section S1 (*Anabolic Agents*).

2.9. UIPM proceeded with the initial review of this result under Article 7.2 of the UIPM Anti-Doping Rules and found that, according to UIPM record, (a) no applicable Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) had been or is the process of being granted to you and (b) there was no apparent departure from the International

Patron:

His Majesty

King Constantine

Honorary President:

His Serene Highness

Prince Albert II of Monaco

Headquarters:

Stade Louis II – Entrée C

19 avenue des Castelans

MC-98000 Monaco

Tel.: +377 97 77 85 55

Fax: +377 97 77 85 50

Mail: uipm@pentathlon.org

Website : www.pentathlon.org



Standard for Testing or Laboratory that could undermine the validity of the Adverse Analytical Findings (AAF).

2.10. By email dated 15th March 2021, the Athlete was informed by UIPM of an adverse analytical finding (“**AAF**”) in his A-sample as a result of the test and invited him to provide his comments within 20 days (“**Notification**”).

2.11. Among other things, by means of the Notification, the Athlete was informed that, in accordance with Article 7.4.1 of the UIPM Rules, the Athlete was provisionally suspended from the date of receipt of the Notification from national and international competitions until this procedure has been completed.

2.12. By email dated 5th April 2021:

2.12.1. The Athlete waived the right of analysis of the so-called B-sample;

2.12.2. the Athlete requested a 30-day extension of the deadline for the submission of the Athlete’s explanation pursuant to para. 6 of the Notification;

2.12.3. the Athlete requested a hearing to be held in the present matter;

2.13. On 6th May 2021, the Athlete, through his legal counsels, requested to UIPM an additional two weeks extension in order to carry out further analysis and verifications on certain samples of supplements.

Section II – Request for lifting a Temporary Suspension

2.14. By email sent on 31st May 2021, the Athlete requested that this Panel eliminate the provisional suspension imposed by the notification dated 15th March 2021.

2.15. Pursuant to Article 7.4.1 of the UIPM Rules, the provisional suspension may be eliminated if the Athlete demonstrates to the UIPM Doping Review Panel that the violation is *likely* to have involved a Contaminated Product.

2.16. Therefore, the Athlete requested that the UIPM Doping Review Panel eliminate the Provisional Suspension imposed by the notification dated 15th March 2021.

2.17. In such respect, on 17th June 2021 the Panel notified to both UIPM and the Athlete that:

2.17.1. the Panel would adjudicate the request to lift the Provisional Suspension;

2.17.2. the parties had a term of 7 (seven) days from the date of the communication to submit written memories;

2.17.3. the procedure would be carried out in written form (according to Article 7.4.3 and the relevant definition of the UIPM Rules);

2.17.4. the parties can waive their respective rights to submit memories. In such a case, the Panel would decide based on the evidences made available to that date.

Patron:

His Majesty

King Constantine

Honorary President:

His Serene Highness

Prince Albert II of Monaco

Headquarters:

Stade Louis II – Entrée C

19 avenue des Castelans

MC-98000 Monaco

Tel.: +377 97 77 85 55

Fax: +377 97 77 85 50

Mail: uipm@pentathlon.org

Website : www.pentathlon.org



- 2.18.** On the deadline indicated by the Panel, neither the Athlete nor UIPM has submitted any written memories.
- 2.19.** By means of a provisional judgement dated 30th June 2021, this Panel ruled rejecting the request from the Athlete, confirming the Provisional Suspension until final adjudication on the case by this Panel.
- 2.20.** According to the provisional judgment, in the opinion of this Panel several aspects of this matter did not find a complete explanation from the Athlete and therefore the relevant burden of proof had not been met. Therefore, at such stage the provisional measures applied by UIPM (in particular, the Provisional Suspension imposed) was not to be lifted and had to be confirmed until the end of the current proceeding relating to this case (and relevant decision on definitive sanctions and consequences to be applied).

Patron:
His Majesty
King Constantine

Honorary President:
His Serene Highness
Prince Albert II of Monaco

Headquarters:
Stade Louis II – Entrée C
19 avenue des Castelans
MC-98000 Monaco

Tel.: +377 97 77 85 55
Fax: +377 97 77 85 50
Mail: uipm@pentathlon.org
Website : www.pentathlon.org

Section III - Hearing

- 2.21.** Following the above, the Athlete submitted through his legal counsel a written statement dated 12th September 2021 in respect of the alleged violation of Art. 2.1 of UIPM Anti-Doping Rules effective from 1 January 2021, including the submission of additional documental evidences; by means of this statement, the Athlete requested this Panel to *“a. find that he bears no Fault and is immediately eligible to compete. b. strictly in the alternative, find that he bears No Significant Fault and sanction him with a reprimand and no period of ineligibility so that he is immediately eligible to compete”*.
- 2.22.** UIPM submitted a written statement dated 21st September 2021, reiterating the request to apply a sanction of a period of ineligibility of 4 (four) years.
- 2.23.** On 12th November 2021, this Panel held a on-line hearing in videoconference, with the presence of both UIPM and the Athlete (**“Hearing”**). In the course of the Hearing:
- 2.23.1.** the Chairman of the Panel introduced the requested of the Parties;
- 2.23.2.** the Parties reiterated their requests;
- 2.23.3.** upon request of the Athlete’s counsels, the witness Dr. Gennady Zheludev (**“Dr. Zheludev”**), Russian pentathlon national team medic, had been called to testify.
- 2.24.** In addition to the above, the Panel admitted (and UIPM did not object to) additional evidence from the Athlete, that had been delivered on 15 November 2021.

Section IV – Evidences and Argument from the Athlete

- 2.25.** Evidences and arguments have been provided by the Athlete in order to prove non voluntary ingestion of the Prohibited Substance due to accidental contamination.
- 2.26.** Evidences and arguments have been submitted (i) by means of the request to lift the Provisional Suspension issued by UIPM, dated 31st May 2021; (ii) by means of the subsequent written statement dated 12th September 2021; (iii) by



calling a witness, Dr. Zheludev in the context of the Hearing; (iv) by submitting additional evidences, admitted by the Panel, delivered via email on 15th November 2021.

- 2.27.** For the purpose of this decision, the Panel considers globally all arguments and evidences delivered from time to time by the Athlete. Therefore the matter is considered jointly in this specific section of the decision.
- 2.28.** The Athlete states that the most likely source of the Substance metabolite in the Sample appears being a nutritional supplement named “ZMA Pro 90 Caps” manufactured by a Russian company Russport LLC under the brand name “Wolf Sport” specifically the supplement manufactured on 15 May 2019, lot number 07011905. (the “ZMA”).
- 2.29.** The Athlete declares to have received three bottles of the ZMA in late 2020 from his team medic, who, in turn, procured the ZMA, along with other supplements, from FMBA, a government funded entity engaged, among other things, in sourcing and distribution of pharmaceutical products and supplements to Russian national teams. Russport LLC would have procured a considerable batch of ZMA and delivered to FMBA. Evidences have been provided to confirm those circumstances.
- 2.30.** Therefore, according to the Athlete, the AAF depended on the ingestion of a Contaminated Product, that is “a product that contains a Prohibited Substance that is not disclosed on the product label or in information available in a reasonable Internet search”.
- 2.31.** In order to prove the above, the Athlete submitted a considerable number of documental evidences. Those include, among other things:
- 2.31.1.** testing of two bottles of ZMA, that were transmitted to a German Laboratory NSF Erdmann Analytics GmbH of Rheida-Wiedernbrueck for testing. The testing mentioned above evidenced different contamination levels of the Metabolite:
- (a) Sealed bottle: > 20ng/g
 - (b) Opened bottle: < 20 ng/g
- 2.31.2.** three scanned copies of what appears to be a registry written in Russian language, dated, respectively, 10th March 2020; 20th September 2020; 25th October 2020, A translation is also provided, not relating to the pages in their entirety, but only to some of their parts. Based on visual analysis of the evidences, the left page of each scan provides a numbered list of athletes including the name of the Athlete, while the second page provides a numbered list of supplements. The number of the Athlete never matches the number of the supplement ZMA; in two cases on three, the name of the Athlete is included in a parenthesis that

Patron:
His Majesty
King Constantine

Honorary President:
His Serene Highness
Prince Albert II of Monaco

Headquarters:
Stade Louis II – Entrée C
19 avenue des Castelans
MC-98000 Monaco

Tel.: +377 97 77 85 55
Fax: +377 97 77 85 50
Mail: uipm@pentathlon.org
Website : www.pentathlon.org



seems to cover all names of the athletes (as indicating that all athletes received the same supplements). According to the evidences provided by the Athlete, ZMA has a prescription of 2-4 caps, twice a day (minimum prescription is 4 caps per day).

- 2.31.3.** scientific publications on accidental contamination (and its effect on results of antidoping testings), confirming the argument according to which an accidental contamination via ZMA tables would be compatible with the results of the AAF;
- 2.31.4.** evidences that other cases occurred, involving the manufacturer Russport LLC, in respect of contamination of supplements;
- 2.31.5.** evidences on the source of the ZMA, including documentation from Russian public bodies relating to the supply of ZMA; and
- 2.31.6.** statements from both the Athlete and Dr. Zheludev on the matters referred to into the Athlete's statement.

2.32. In addition to the above, in the course of the Hearing the witness Dr. Zheludev was interviewed on the following circumstances (the content of the interview has been summarized for illustration purposes):

- 2.32.1.** *Can he confirm he was the team medic for the Russian team ? Yes*
- 2.32.2.** *Did he actually assessed the physical condition of Athlete? Yes*
- 2.32.3.** *Did he administer the supplement to the Athlete? Yes*
- 2.32.4.** *Did he require any supplement to be mandatorily ingested by the Athlete? The medical team provided recommendations in respect of the assumption. ZMA was part of a broad administering of supplements and, in such specific case, recommendation was 2/4 tablet per day.*
- 2.32.5.** *Was the dosage demanded by the Athlete? No, the medical team exercised a daily control and the Athlete received a specific dosage in line with the above.*
- 2.32.6.** *How many competitions did the Athlete attend? As I recall in 2020 he joined three national competitions.*
- 2.32.7.** *Did any other members were prescribed with the same supplement? Yes, all athletes received recommendation of ZMA and none of those had issues with anti-doping testing. We as team medics work with athletes in respect of all cases – however I have no recalling of activities carried out in Kyrgyzstan camp.*
- 2.32.8.** *Did you attend the training camp in Kyrgyzstan? Did you control the Athlete? No in both cases.*

3. JURISDICTION. APPLICABLE RULES

Patron:

His Majesty

King Constantine

Honorary President:

His Serene Highness

Prince Albert II of Monaco

Headquarters:

Stade Louis II – Entrée C

19 avenue des Castelans

MC-98000 Monaco

Tel.: +377 97 77 85 55

Fax: +377 97 77 85 50

Mail: uipm@pentathlon.org

Website : www.pentathlon.org



Jurisdiction and governing rules

3.1. In accordance with WADA's World Anti-doping Code, UIPM has implemented its UIPM Rules, in accordance with UIPM's responsibilities under the Code, and in furtherance of UIPM's continuing efforts to eradicate doping in sport.

3.2. As per Article 8.1 of the UIPM Rules, this Panel is the responsible body to adjudicate cases relating to violations of the UIPM Rules and, more precisely,

has jurisdiction to hear and determine whether an Athlete or other Person, subject to these Anti-Doping Rules, has committed an anti-doping rule violation and, if applicable, to impose relevant Consequences

3.3. The provisions of the UIPM Rules, entitled "Scope of these antidoping rules", stipulates that such rules shall apply to, among others:

all Athletes and Athlete Support Personnel who are members of UIPM, or of any National Federation, or of any member or affiliate organization of any National Federation (including any clubs, teams, associations, or leagues);

3.4. In the case at hand, the Russian Federation is a member of UIPM and the Athlete is affiliated with the Russian Federation.

3.5. Therefore, the Athlete is bound by the UIPM Rules.

3.6. Pursuant to Article 8.1.2.2 of the UIPM Rules:

The Chair of the Doping Review Panel shall appoint either three (3) members (which may include the Chair) or a single adjudicator, who can be the Chair, to hear a case, depending on the nature of the charge and the evidence put forward.

3.7. In the case at hand, the UIPM Doping Review Panel Chairman chose to decide on this case by appointing a pool of 3-members. In such respect:

3.7.1. the members of the Panel have been appointed in accordance with the provisions of Article 8.1 of the UIPM Rules;

3.7.2. on 2nd June 2021, the appointment of the Panel has been communicated by the secretariat of the Panel to all parties involved, and a term of 7 (seven) days has been granted to the parties to bring any challenges in relation to the appointment of the Panel;

3.7.3. no challenges have been brought by any of the parties and, therefore, the Panel is validly established.

3.8. As the facts relating to the case at hand occurred on 27th February 2022, the UIPM Rules in its version in force starting from 1 January 2021 shall apply *ratione temporis*.

Patron:

His Majesty

King Constantine

Honorary President:

His Serene Highness

Prince Albert II of Monaco

Headquarters:

Stade Louis II – Entrée C

19 avenue des Castelans

MC-98000 Monaco

Tel.: +377 97 77 85 55

Fax: +377 97 77 85 50

Mail: uipm@pentathlon.org

Website : www.pentathlon.org



Application of UIPM Rules

- 3.9.** Under Article 3.1 UIPM Rules, UIPM has the burden of establishing that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred. In such respect, it must be observed that the AAF communicated to the Athlete has not been challenged, no remarks have been made on the analysis of the Sample (that had been carried out in a WADA accredited laboratory) and the Athlete also waived its right to have the B-Sample tested.
- 3.10.** Therefore it can be said that the results of the AAF are established as a matter of fact.
- 3.11.** In the case at hand, the Athlete argues that he is victim of an very rare (but nonetheless possible to occur) case of contamination of supplement. In light of prevailing jurisprudence and the UIPM rules, the Athlete must provide concrete evidence (i) that the AAF arises from contamination (ii) that contamination is *accidental*, so that no fault or no significant fault can be attributed to the Athlete.
- 3.12.** Under the same Article 3.1, where the UIPM Rules place the burden of proof upon the Athlete or other Person alleged to have committed an anti-doping rule violation to rebut a presumption or establish specified facts or circumstances (and this is the case), the standard of proof shall be by a balance of probability.
- 3.13.** The balance of probability standard means that the indicted athlete bears the burden of persuading the judging body that the occurrence of the circumstances on which he relies is more probable than their non-occurrence or more probable than other possible explanations of the doping offence. This means also that the evidence considered must be *specific* and *decisive* to explain the athlete's departure from the expected standard of behaviour.
- 3.14.** One appellant's failure to submit corroborating evidence establishing his/her absence of intent to commit an anti-doping rule violation shall result in the requirement of the aforementioned standard not having been met.
- 3.15.** Moreover, according to long established CAS jurisprudence, the athlete needs to convince the panel that the occurrence of the circumstances on which the athlete relies is *more probable* than their non-occurrence. To establish the origin of the prohibited substance it is not sufficient for an athlete merely to protest his or her innocence and suggest that the substance must have entered his or her body inadvertently from some supplement, medicine or other product. Rather, an athlete must adduce *concrete evidence* to demonstrate that a particular supplement, medication or other product that the athlete took contained the substance in question. Necessary are for example details about the date of the intake, the location and route of intake or any other details of the ingestion (see e.g., CAS 2016/A/4377).

Patron:

His Majesty

King Constantine

Honorary President:

His Serene Highness

Prince Albert II of Monaco

Headquarters:

Stade Louis II – Entrée C

19 avenue des Castelans

MC-98000 Monaco

Tel.: +377 97 77 85 55

Fax: +377 97 77 85 50

Mail: uipm@pentathlon.org

Website : www.pentathlon.org



- 3.16.** In the case at hand, in order to establish the source of contamination, the Athlete detects ZMA as the likely source of contamination and provides testing of two bottles of ZMA, both resulting to be contaminated.
- 3.17.** While this Panel notes that the testing carried out by the Athlete has been made in a non-WADA-accredited laboratory, the Panel also notes that the results from this laboratory have not been challenged by UIPM. Therefore for the purpose of this decision, this Panel considers as a matter of fact that contamination of the two bottles has been established.
- 3.18.** As per the where the two tested bottles come from, the Athlete affirms that at least one bottle of ZMA is the original product delivered by the Russian Federation medical team.
- 3.19.** In this respect, the Panel notes that:
- 3.19.1.** delivery of three bottles of ZMA is confirmed by the statement of Dr. Zheludev, largely supported by evidence provided, and is not contested by UIPM. Therefore this circumstance can be considered as a matter of fact;
- 3.19.2.** the first statement of the Athlete of 31st May 2021 indicates that *“The Athlete received three bottles of the ZMA in late 2020 from his team medic [...]”* *“[o]verall, the Athlete received three bottles of ZMA, of which he consumed less than two”* and that *“The Athlete submitted two bottles of the ZMA for analysis to NSF Erdmann Analytics GmbH, a laboratory in Germany. One bottle was open and contained the ZMA capsules remaining after the consumption in early 2021. The second bottle was sealed”* (page 2). It can be easily deduced from this first submission that the Athlete consumed less than 180 tablets of ZMA, likely less than the prescription from the Russian team medic, and that two bottles of ZMA sourced by the Russian team medic have been sent to testing;
- 3.19.3.** according to the second statement of 12th September 2021, however, the Athlete affirms to have ingested *“a total of 186 capsules of ZMA”*. In addition the Athlete also clearly states that three bottles of ZMA had been used (page 4 of the submission).
- 3.20.** In light of the above, the source of the second bottle (used as proxy for the analysis) remains unclear and not directly associated with the production lot delivered to the Russian Federation. This circumstance however is not directly relevant for the purpose of this decision and therefore no further inquiry will be carried out in such respect.
- 3.21.** From a medical point of view, this Panel acknowledges that, regardless the of the consumption of *more than* two bottles, or *less than two* bottles, both scenarios are compatible with an accidental contamination.
- 3.22.** The Panel also recognizes that the time schedule of consumption by the Athlete is theoretically compatible with accidental contamination. Therefore, the circumstance that assumption of ZMA was not declared in the context of the

Patron:
His Majesty
King Constantine

Honorary President:
His Serene Highness
Prince Albert II of Monaco

Headquarters:
Stade Louis II – Entrée C
19 avenue des Castelans
MC-98000 Monaco

Tel.: +377 97 77 85 55
Fax: +377 97 77 85 50
Mail: uipm@pentathlon.org
Website : www.pentathlon.org



Sample (see par. 2.4 above) becomes not relevant for the purpose of this decision.

3.23. Having said the above, with reference to the conduct of the Athlete, this Panel notes that:

3.23.1. consumption of ZMA is affirmed by the Athlete in his 12th September 2021 statement, being it occurred during *four* training camps. In particular, this Panel highlights this sentence relating to the conduct of the Athlete in the fourth training camp held in Kirgizstan (exact location remains unnoticed): *“The Athlete consumed three ZMA capsules per day, from 1 till 15 February, a total of 45 capsules, [...] He used the ZMA leftovers from the November camp and opened the third bottle.”* (page 4);

3.23.2. while the Athlete affirms that consumption occurred *“pursuant to the recommendations of Dr. Zheludev”* (page 4), Dr. Zheludev affirmed not be present in the Kirgizstan training camp (see witness statement in the course of the hearing, par. 2.32.8 above). The statement of the Athlete is therefore incorrect, or must be construed as *“pursuant to the recommendation of Dr. Zheludev provided in the course of a previous camp”*.

3.24. This Panel notes that it is quite a peculiar circumstance that an Athlete, in the context of a controlled environment as a training camp, proceeds with the ingestion of supplement without medical supervision. This is, however, a matter of pure speculation, and not directly relevant for the purpose of this decision.

3.25. Indeed, in respect of the conduct of the Athlete, it must be considered that, in line with CAS jurisprudence: *“The fact for an athlete to comply with the directions of a team doctor in taking a product does not absolve him/her from all liability. [...] It behoves those who choose to enter on complicated regimes of supplements in an endeavour to maximise their performance to take the greatest care not only in what they take, but in how they declare it. However, the fact that a supplement had been used over a substantial period without any adverse consequences weighs substantially in the favour of an athlete. However, even if an athlete cannot be expected to carry out regular analysis of each new batch, there should be evidence of care being taken by an athlete to ensure the product was and continued to be appropriate”* (see CAS 2015/A/4129).

3.26. In the case at hand, even assuming that all facts and circumstances indicated by the Athlete are true and correct, it remains still unchallenged that the Athlete took the supplement outside from medical supervision (at least in the latest camp, at least according to the evidence set provided).

3.27. Therefore in accordance with UIPM Rules, *Fault* cannot be entirely excluded in respect of the alleged contamination occurred. Nevertheless, taking into account all circumstances occurred, the Athlete is allowed to benefit from a reduction in terms of applicable sanctions, as better set out below.

Patron:
His Majesty
King Constantine

Honorary President:
His Serene Highness
Prince Albert II of Monaco

Headquarters:
Stade Louis II – Entrée C
19 avenue des Castelans
MC-98000 Monaco

Tel.: +377 97 77 85 55
Fax: +377 97 77 85 50
Mail: uipm@pentathlon.org
Website : www.pentathlon.org



4. SANCTIONS AND CONSEQUENCES

Period of Ineligibility

- 4.1. UIPM requested that an ineligibility period of 4 (four) years should apply to the Athlete's ADRV.
- 4.2. Pursuant to Article 10.2.1 of the UIPM Rules, the base sanction for the presence of the Prohibited Substance is a 4 (four) year period ineligibility, unless the Athlete or other Person can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was not intentional.
- 4.3. Pursuant to Article 10.6.1.2 of the UIPM Rules, however, in cases where the Athlete can establish both No Significant Fault or Negligence and that the detected Prohibited Substance (other than a Substance of Abuse) came from a Contaminated Product, then the period of Ineligibility shall be, at a minimum, a reprimand and no period of Ineligibility, and at a maximum, two (2) years Ineligibility, depending on the Athlete or other Person's degree of Fault.
- 4.4. In the case at hand, this Panel acknowledges the possible contamination from Contaminated Product (even though within the limits already highlighted above) and affirms that the Athlete can benefit from the more favourable regime provided by the UIPM where *No Significant Fault or Negligence* occurs.
- 4.5. In conclusion, the UIPM Doping Review Panel considers that the period of ineligibility indicated in paragraph 5 (*Ruling*) below should apply in this case.

Commencement of the Period of Ineligibility and Credit for Provisional Suspension.

- 4.6. As to the commencement date of the period of ineligibility, art. 10.13 of the UIPM Rules provides that, as a general rule, the period of ineligibility shall start on the date of the Panel's decision.
- 4.7. However, according to Article 10.13.2 of the UIPM Rules, considering that the Athlete is already serving a period of Provisional Suspension starting from 15th March 2021, then the Athlete shall receive a credit for such period of Provisional Suspension against the period of Ineligibility imposed.
- 4.8. In light of the above, the period of Provisional Suspension shall be deducted from the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility.

Financial Consequences

- 4.9. According to Article 10.12 of the UIPM Rules, where an Athlete commits an anti-doping rule violation, UIPM may, in its discretion and subject to the principle of proportionality, elect to (a) recover from the Athlete costs associated with the anti-doping rule violation, regardless of the period of Ineligibility imposed and/or (b) fine the Athlete or other Person in an amount up to EUR 1,000, only in cases where the maximum period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable has already been imposed.

Patron:
His Majesty
King Constantine

Honorary President:
His Serene Highness
Prince Albert II of Monaco

Headquarters:
Stade Louis II – Entrée C
19 avenue des Castelans
MC-98000 Monaco

Tel.: +377 97 77 85 55
Fax: +377 97 77 85 50
Mail: uipm@pentathlon.org
Website : www.pentathlon.org



Patron:
His Majesty
King Constantine

Honorary President:
His Serene Highness
Prince Albert II of Monaco

Headquarters:
Stade Louis II – Entrée C
19 avenue des Castelans
MC-98000 Monaco

Tel.: +377 97 77 85 55
Fax: +377 97 77 85 50
Mail: uipm@pentathlon.org
Website : www.pentathlon.org

4.10. In the case at hand and considering the circumstances occurred as a whole and that no requests came from UIPM in such respect, the Panel considers that no Financial Consequences (within the meaning described above) shall arise from the ADRV and/or from the relating results management process.

Appeal

4.11. In accordance with Article 13.2.1, this decision may be appealed exclusively to CAS.

4.12. The time to file an appeal to CAS for the Athlete shall be 21 (twenty-one) days from the date of receipt of the decision by the appealing party.

5. RULING

In light of the above, the UIPM Doping Review Panel decides as follows:

- 5.1.** Mr. DANIL KALIMUNIN is found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1 of the UIPM Rules.
- 5.2.** Mr. DANIL KALIMUNIN is sanctioned with a period of ineligibility of 12 (twelve) months. Ineligibility is used as defined in the UIPM Rules and means the Athlete being “*barred on account of an anti-doping rule violation for a specified period of time from participating in any Competition or other activity or funding as provided in Article 10.14*”;
- 5.3.** The ineligibility period imposed to Mr. DANIL KALIMUNIN is served starting from the date of 15th March 2021. The period of Provisional Suspension already served is therefore deducted from the applicable period of Ineligibility.
- 5.4.** The Panel decided that no “*Financial Consequences*” or costs recovery associated with the rule violation shall apply.
- 5.5.** Public Disclosure” or “Public Reporting” of the fact and terms of this decision on the general public is justified and authorizes it in accordance (and within the limits set by) Articles 13 and 14 of the UIPM Code.
- 5.6.** Appeal is possible within the time limits and to the competent bodies as already set out above.

The Panel
Dr. Alfonso Parziale – Chair
Dr. Tomáš Pagáč
Prof. Eduardo Henrique De Rose

Made in Rome (Italy), dated 30 November 2021

UIPM Doping Panel Chairman
on behalf of the Panel
Dr. Alfonso Parziale