

***IMPORTANT NOTE: This version is a translation of the original French version***

**SPORT DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE OF CANADA (SDRCC)  
CENTRE DE RÈGLEMENT DES DIFFÉRENDS SPORTIFS DU CANADA (CRDSC)**

**May 25, 2010**

**N°: SDRCC 10-0121**

**MAUDE L'ÉCUYER LAFLEUR  
(Claimant)**

**and**

**KARATÉ CANADA  
(Respondent)**

**and**

**NADJA BRATIC  
(Affected Party)**

**DECISION AND REASONS**

**ARBITRATOR**

**Henri R. PALLARD**

**APPEARANCES**

**For the Claimant:**

**Maude L'ÉCUYER LAFLEUR  
Germain BISSON**

**For the Respondent:**

**Steven INDIG**

**For the Affected Party:**

**Sahereh BAGHBANI  
John CURTIS**

**HEARING**

**Place:**

**Teleconference, Sudbury, Ontario**

**Decision:**

**May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2010**

**Reasons for decision:**

**May 25<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

## **AWARD AND REASONS**

1. Karate Canada, the Respondent, did not include Maude L'Écuyer Lafleur, the Claimant, in its team for the 2010 Panamerican Senior Championships because the Claimant failed to respond to the request for confirmation of her participation. The Claimant is appealing this decision. She is Francophone and the Respondent's request for confirmation was sent in English only. She alleges that the Respondent did not comply with its policy to communicate with athletes in both official languages. The Respondent named Nadja Bratic, the Affected party, to replace the Claimant on the national team. According to the Affected Party, the Respondent's decision should be upheld because the Claimant knew that she was expected to confirm her participation.

### **The issues**

2. This appeal raises three issues. Firstly, should the Respondent have provided the confirmation request in French and English, as per its Language Policy? Secondly, was it reasonable for the Claimant to expect to receive the email in French in view of the Respondent's past communication practices? Thirdly, did the Claimant agree to receive communications in English from the Respondent considering she had already used English in past communications?

### **The decision**

3. On May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2010, given the urgent nature of the matter, I issued a short decision in favour of the Claimant and ordered Karate Canada to include the Claimant in the national team for the 2010 Panamerican Senior Championships. I also indicated that written reasons would be provided at a later date.

4. According to the Respondent, the order to include the Claimant in the national team at the 2010 Panamerican Senior Championships would lead to the removal of the Affected Party from the team due to the limited number of places available. I did not issue an order regarding the Affected Party's participation at the Panamerican Championships because the parties did not ask me to address this matter.

### **Preliminary issues**

5. I held a preliminary teleconference with the parties on April 28<sup>th</sup> to establish a schedule. The Canadian team was scheduled to leave Canada on May 10<sup>th</sup> for the 2010 Panamerican Senior Championships to be held in Ecuador from May 13<sup>th</sup> to May 15<sup>th</sup>. A schedule for filing submissions was established in consultation with the parties and a hearing was set for April 30<sup>th</sup> to discuss preliminary matters. The hearing on the substantive issues was scheduled for May 1<sup>st</sup>. It was agreed that reasons would be provided at a later date in order to provide a decision on the substantive issues by Monday, May 3<sup>rd</sup>.

6. The Affected Party raised three questions during the hearing on preliminary issues. She requested some information from Karate Canada; she challenged the jurisdiction of the Sport

Dispute Resolution Centre of Canada (SDRCC); and alleged a conflict of interest between Rébecca Khoury, the Respondent's president, and Germain Bisson, the Claimant's coach. During the hearing on the substantive issues, the Affected Party abandoned all allegations related to these three preliminary issues. Under the circumstances, there is no need for me to provide reasons on these issues since they have become moot and did not play any role in the Affected Party's submissions. In addition, during the hearing on preliminary issues, I gave the Affected Party the opportunity to raise these three issues again during the hearing on the substantive issues should it be necessary in light of the evidence.

7. During the hearing on preliminary issues, the Affected Party requested a postponement of the hearing on the substantive issues until May 3<sup>rd</sup>. The lawyer, who in the meantime had accepted to represent her, was not available on May 1<sup>st</sup>, the date agreed upon during the preliminary teleconference. The Claimant and the Respondent opposed the request. I refused the request to postpone the hearing on the substantive issues for two reasons. Firstly, all involved parties had already agreed on the schedule, and secondly, the postponement would negatively impact the issuance of my decision within the timeframe required for an athlete to participate in the Panamerican Championships. The Affected Party's lawyer was able to modify his schedule to be present at the hearing. I wish to thank the Affected Party's representatives for their efforts to attend the hearing in order to allow for a prompt decision on substantive issues.

### **The facts**

8. The Canadian championships took place in Toronto from March 19<sup>th</sup> to March 21<sup>st</sup>. A meeting with national team members and medalists took place immediately following the competition. The interpreter was too busy and could not be present. In fact, coaches were informed at that time that nothing would be translated for the next 10 days. Manuel Monzon, Karate Canada's head coach, translated the presentation to athletes from English to French. During the presentation, Paul Oliver, Assistant Head Coach and Manager of the junior and senior national teams, informed athletes they would soon be receiving an important e-mail which required them to confirm their participation in the Panamerican Championships before March 31<sup>st</sup>. He indicated that athletes who failed to respond would be replaced. The message was repeated several times in English and translated into French by Manuel Monzon.

9. Apparently, the Claimant was very tired and did not hear this message. She had competed in three different categories for three days. In fact, during the hearing, Manuel Monzon highlighted her excellent performance during the Canadian championships. After the competition, the Claimant was required to attend the medal presentation ceremony and a meeting of the Québec team, and only after did she join the Canadian team's meeting.

10. On March 23<sup>rd</sup>, Paul Oliver sent an English-only message to athletes on behalf of Karate Canada.

Please find attached a spreadsheet listing the 2010 Sr. team invited to attend the senior pan ams in Quito, Ecuador May 10 to

May 16. You have until March 30, 2010 to respond with your commitment to go.

Responses not received by 8 pm Eastern March 30, will be considered as not going. After all responses are received, you will be notified to purchase your ticket, for arrival & departure.

[TRANSLATION] S'il vous plaît, veuillez trouver en pièce jointe un tableau faisant état de l'équipe senior 2010 invitée à participer aux championnats panaméricains seniors à Quito, Équateur, du 10 au 16 mai. Vous avez jusqu'au 30 mars 2010 pour communiquer votre engagement pour y participer.

Les réponses qui ne sont pas reçues au plus tard à 20 heures de l'Est le 30 mars seront interprétées comme un refus d'y participer. Une fois que toutes les réponses seront reçues, on vous avisera d'acheter votre billet, de l'arrivée et du départ.

This was the e-mail mentioned by Paul Oliver at the meeting following the Canadian championships. The document attached to the e-mail listed only senior team members and the Claimant's name was included.

11. The Claimant tried to understand the English-only e-mail as best she could but did not fully grasp its meaning. Seeing her name on the list in the attached document, she concluded that she was part of the senior national team for the Panamerican Championships. She never responded to the e-mail within the stated deadline.

12. On April 7<sup>th</sup>, the Claimant received an e-mail regarding training at altitude for the upcoming competition in Ecuador, another e-mail on April 10<sup>th</sup> regarding the purchase of plane tickets, and a third e-mail on April 13<sup>th</sup> regarding the Panamerican Championship schedule. These e-mails confirmed her belief that she was part of the team that would be competing in Ecuador and, on April 15<sup>th</sup>, she sent Karate Canada proof of purchase of her plane fare. A few minutes after sending her April 15<sup>th</sup> e-mail, the Claimant received a response from Paul Oliver stating that she had failed to respond by the March 30<sup>th</sup> deadline and had consequently been replaced by another athlete on the national team.

13. According to the Respondent, the order to include the Claimant in the national team competing in the 2010 Panamerican Senior Championships would force them to remove the Affected Party from the national team due to the limited number of places that it had available for this competition.

### **Allegations**

14. According to the Claimant, the Respondent's March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 e-mail was so important that it should have been sent in both official languages as per its Language Policy. This e-mail described the national team selection process and stated that in the absence of a response, the recipient would be excluded from the team. Ultimately, the Claimant's argument is based on the

following: it was reasonable for her to expect to receive an e-mail in French in light of the Language Policy adopted by the Respondent and in light of the Respondent's practice of sending the terms and conditions of competitions in both official languages.

15. According to the Affected Party, it was not reasonable under the circumstances for the Claimant to expect to receive the March 23<sup>rd</sup> invitation in both French and English. The Language Policy is subject to exceptions and, in this context, did not warrant the translation of the March 23<sup>rd</sup> e-mail. In addition, the Claimant understood English and had previously communicated with the Respondent in that language.

16. During the hearing, the Respondent did not present evidence or cross-examine any witnesses, but simply made submissions of form that addressed neither the Claimant's nor the Affected Party's allegations. The Respondent did not dispute the facts presented by the parties or their interpretation of its policy.

### **Analysis of the allegations**

#### ***The Language Policy***

17. Karaté Canada adopted a Language Policy which states:

1. Karate Canada is committed to the promotion and use of the two (2) official languages of Canada in the delivery of its services.

2. The Karate Canada official languages policy is founded on the belief in and respect for the linguistic rights of members of Karate Canada. In keeping with that belief, the purpose and application of the official languages policy is consistent with the spirit and intent of both the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) and the Official Languages Act (1988).

3. All important communications such as corporate documents, newsletters, press releases and specified bulletins should be translated. In addition, all publications will be provided in both official languages and Karate Canada will endeavour to serve individuals in both official languages.

4. All correspondence to the Karate Canada office will be responded to in the official language in which it is received.

5. If there are any discrepancies or disputes as to whether or not a document requires translation, determination will be made by either the Executive Committee or Executive Director.

At first glance, receiving communications in the official language of choice does not seem to be an absolute right.

18. However, a close reading of the policy reveals that the nature and scope of the obligations set out in paragraph 3 are unclear. Use of the verb “should” is more indicative of a *desire* that all important communications be translated. It does not seem to be the Respondent’s objective to translate all communications. In addition, the Respondent must only *endeavour* to serve individuals in both official languages. However, it is imperative that publications *be provided* in both official languages. It is difficult to understand how communications can be provided in both official languages if their translation is merely desirable. Instead, the use of “should” indicates a *condition* that makes possible the obligation to provide communications in both official languages. If “should” is a *condition* for providing information, it cannot at the same time imply a *desire* and all important communications must therefore be translated. Accordingly, the March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 e-mail should have been translated.

19. In addition, the Respondent did not introduce evidence, contradict any evidence or cross-examine any of the witnesses. Accordingly, there is no evidence that the Respondent endeavoured in some way to send the e-mail in French. Therefore, I conclude that no effort whatsoever was made to send the e-mail in French. This lack of effort and the act of sending the e-mail in English only does not comply with the requirements set out in paragraph 3.

20. One must also ask whether the object of paragraph 3 is to create two classes of communications. In the first class, there would be communications where it is optional to use both official languages, more specifically “all important communications such as corporate documents, newsletters, press releases and specified bulletins” which “should be translated”, and communications as part of the Respondent’s commitment “to serve individuals in both official languages.” In the second class, there would be communications that demand both official languages, specifically “all publications”. Yet, it is not clear if the second class is distinct from the first class, or how certain instances of the first class are not also included in the second class. The Language Policy adopted by the Respondent raises many difficulties of interpretation. I did not have the benefit of any submissions by the Respondent on its interpretation of its policy.

21. According to the Affected Party, the Respondent complied with the intent of the policy because paragraph 5 affords the Respondent a certain discretion to decide which documents require translation. This paragraph provides a mechanism to determine how to handle disputes regarding the decision whether to translate a document. In such a case, the Executive Committee or Executive Director decides. However, this paragraph does not seem to be applicable in the present circumstances. The Respondent did not present any evidence or cross-examine any witnesses. Accordingly, it was not possible to establish if the e-mail was considered a document and if there was a dispute about its translation. Since there is no proof that the Executive Director or Executive Committee decided not to translate the March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 e-mail, paragraph 5 is not relevant to the resolution of the dispute between the parties.

22. Paragraph 4 of the policy establishes an absolute standard. It requires the Respondent to reply in the official language in which a communication is received. It is important to note the limited scope of this obligation. It does not require the Respondent to use the recipient’s official language when the communication emanates from the Respondent. The choice of language

when sending a message is limited by paragraph 3. I will return below to the question of the language of correspondence between the Claimant and Respondent.

23. Considering the difficulty surrounding the interpretation and application of the Language Policy, especially as it pertains to paragraphs 3 and 5, I believe we should ultimately refer to paragraphs 1 and 2 which lay the foundation of the policy. According to paragraph 1, the Respondent “is committed to the promotion and use of the two (2) official languages of Canada in the delivery of its services”. This statement is not limited in any way and any such limitation to the use of the official languages must be justified by one of the other paragraphs of the policy. If the terms of a possible limitation are unclear, then paragraph 1 should be determinative in order to give effect to the Language Policy. Paragraph 1 must be interpreted within the context established by paragraph 2, or, more specifically, in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Official Languages Act.

24. Since paragraph 1 describes the broad application of the policy, and because potential limitations are ambiguous, I conclude that the e-mail of March 23<sup>rd</sup> should comply with the requirements set out in paragraph 1 of the Language Policy, namely that it should have been sent in both official languages. This interpretation is in line with the interpretive framework of paragraph 2 of the Language Policy.

25. I wish to stress that the limited scope of this decision which only applies to the Respondent’s Language Policy. This decision addresses neither the consequence of incorporating the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Official Languages Act into the policy, nor the nature of the rights and obligations that arise from such incorporation. It was not necessary to address these questions in order to decide this matter.

### ***Past practices***

26. According to the Claimant, with regard to team selections, the Respondent sent the documentation inviting athletes to participate in international competitions in both languages. She provided three examples: the 2010 Paris Open, the 2010 senior selection and training camp, and the 2010 North American Cup. In the first two instances, the Respondent’s e-mail sent by Paul Oliver was drafted in English only. However, the message included two attachments – one in English and one in French – providing participation details for the event. In the third instance, the e-mail was in French and English, but without attachments because the required information was already included in the body of the message.

27. The Claimant also mentioned two additional e-mails calling for athletes to participate in the 2010 North American Cup. The first e-mail was sent in English only. The second e-mail dated January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2010 referred to the first email and stated:

The bottom part of this message refers to the NA Cup & was not suppose to be attached to this e-mail until it was translated. Please wait until it is translated and I will send it out to you again.

The only people who need to respond are those athletes who had said no to the NA Cup.

[TRANSLATION] Le message ci-dessous renvoie à la Coupe Amérique du Nord et ne devait pas être joint à ce courriel jusqu'à ce qu'il soit traduit. Veuillez, s'il vous plaît, attendre sa traduction et je vous l'enverrai de nouveau. Les seules personnes qui doivent répondre sont les athlètes qui ont dit non à la Coupe Amérique du Nord.

All e-mails emanated from Paul Oliver. It seems reasonable to conclude, especially considering the follow-up email of January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2010, that the Respondent was required to communicate with athletes in both languages when seeking their participation for competitions or training camps.

28. Considering these emails, it was entirely reasonable for the Claimant to assume that she had been included in the national team to participate in the 2010 Panamerican Senior Championships. Contrary to the January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2010 e-mail, the March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 message was never recalled or corrected despite having been sent in English only. Contrary to the 2010 Paris Open and 2010 Senior selection and training camp e-mails issued in English but with French and English versions of attachments, the March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 email was issued in English only and the attachment named "2010 Senior Pan Am team.xls" contained only a list of names. Upon seeing her name on the list, it was not unreasonable for the Claimant to conclude that she had been chosen to participate in the Panamerican Championships.

29. Since the previous emails seeking athletes' participation in training camps and competitions had been sent in both official languages, and because the Respondent did not present any evidence, did not cross examine any witnesses, and did not contradict any evidence, I conclude that it was the past practice of the Respondent to send emails in both official languages, in compliance with its Language Policy. Under the circumstances, the Claimant could reasonably expect to receive the invitation to participate in the Panamerican Championships in both official languages as per the Respondent's policy.

30. The Respondent requests athletes to sign an undertaking regarding e-mail communications.

Congratulations on your win at the 2009 National Championships. As a *potential member* of the Canadian national Karate team, you will be contacted at various times to supply responses to requests as requested by the national Coaches. As e-mail is our #1 source of communication, it is of vital importance that you supply/update a functioning e-mail address that you check daily. Many requests that will be sent to you are time sensitive, and require you to respond within certain time constraints. Failure on your part to acknowledge/respond to these requests within the given

timeframes will be taken as non-compliance on your part, and you forfeit your rights to any positions on the National Teams, whether Junior or Senior.

It is important that you understand completely that your e-mail address must be legible/clear, and accessible. It is your responsibility to see that this is checked daily and all requested information sent by the stipulated deadlines or you will forfeit your rights to national team Selection/Representation.

...

I have read, understand and accept the consequence of my e-mail communications.

The Claimant acknowledged having read and signed the undertaking which was prepared in French and English. Furthermore, other important documents created by the Respondent were presented in evidence at the hearing: a letter of welcome to the national team (undated), a document entitled "Competitions and Training for the National Senior Team" and another document entitled "Tracksuits", all of which were produced in English and French. This attests to the Respondent's commitment to its Language Policy and to its recognition that practical implications flow from its policy. These documents also create a legitimate expectation with the athletes that they will receive communications and documents in both official languages.

31. The scope of the undertaking signed by the athlete does not limit in any way the Respondent's Language Policy. The Claimant only acknowledged her obligation to read her e-mails daily and to respond within established deadlines, as the case may be. It is also important to note that the Claimant can only reply to e-mails insofar as she understands their content. Considering that this document imposing an obligation to reply is produced by the Respondent in both official languages, it is reasonable to conclude that "urgent" communications that require a response "within certain time constraints" will be written in both official languages. It would be illogical to oblige someone to do something without allowing them to know that it was created. The language of communication is an important issue when agreeing to comply with an obligation, especially if the ensuing obligation is contingent on the future and unknown behavior of the party imposing this obligation. In such circumstances, the party imposing the obligation must ensure that its creation is clearly communicated. The fact that this document is provided in both official languages leads to the conclusion that the communications to which it refers will also be issued in both official languages. Yet, the March 23<sup>rd</sup> e-mail was sent in English only.

### *Use of English by the Claimant*

32. According to the Affected Party, there is no proof that the Claimant repeatedly requested services in French. Because the Claimant never provided a written request for French services, the Affected Party submits that I find that such a request was never made. In addition, the Affected Party alleges that the Claimant's command of English was sufficient to understand the content of the March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 e-mail. Finally, the Claimant had already communicated with the Respondent in English.

### *Request for services in French*

33. On the matter of a request for services in French, according to Paul Oliver, the Claimant never expressed that she preferred communications in French. According to the Claimant, such a request was conveyed repeatedly to the Respondent's President. The Respondent did not contradict this statement and did not call any witnesses or cross-examine any of the witnesses. Under the circumstances, I accept the Claimant's evidence on this matter. In addition, it is not necessary to present such a request in writing. In fact, there is no such requirement in the Language Policy.

34. The Respondent's obligation to use both official languages when issuing important communications is a direct result of its Language Policy. The Respondent may not disregard its obligation by claiming that the athlete did not specifically request to receive communications in one of the official languages. The obligation does not arise from the athlete's request but rather from the Respondent's policy.

### *Proficiency in English*

35. According to Paul Oliver, the Claimant had replied in English to e-mails addressed to her in English, while apologizing for her poor command of the English language. According to Paul Oliver, he had no difficulty understanding her. I do not dispute that Paul Oliver had no difficulty understanding the Claimant when she communicated in English. However, it remains to be seen whether the Claimant's proficiency in English allowed her to understand English. The evidence on this matter is not clear cut. According to the Claimant, she is not proficient in English and, barring absence of evidence to the contrary, I accept the Claimant's evidence.

36. However, even if the Claimant had been skilled and proficient in English, the Respondent was obliged by its Language Policy to communicate with her in the official language of her choice. The Respondent's obligation does not cease at the moment when the Claimant begins to understand the other official language. I will not address the perverse effect that extinguishing the obligation under such circumstances could have. What is important is that the obligation was created by the Respondent and continues as a result of the choice of the Claimant.

37. There is no evidence that the Claimant understood the requirement to respond within established timeframes but deliberately chose not to reply to the e-mail because it was sent in English only. There is no evidence that the Claimant deliberately chose to jeopardize her participation in an international competition because the e-mail was sent in English only.

### *Use of English*

38. The Claimant often communicated with the Respondent in English, but that was out of necessity. She used French when the opportunity presented itself. According to Manuel Monzon, Head Coach, his conversations with the Claimant were always in French. Although he hadn't sent her an e-mail in awhile, he had always used French.

39. The Claimant often sought help from other people to translate e-mails from the Respondent. She learned to deal with this practice. However, on March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 she did not have the benefit of such help. Also, the Claimant had previously replied to the Respondent's e-mails in English and often asked other people to help her draft her reply.

40. According to Manuel Monzon's testimony, at the conclusion of the March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting, he told athletes that they could confirm verbally with him their intention to participate in the Panamerican championships. The Claimant did not do so. However, this is not fatal to her appeal. In fact, if the verbal confirmation was meant to be definitive, the March 23<sup>rd</sup> email would be irrelevant. The March 21<sup>st</sup> verbal instruction was merely an opportunity provided to the athlete and I cannot draw a negative conclusion from the fact that she did not confirm verbally at that very moment her participation in the Panamerican Championships.

41. It could be argued that the Claimant was informed of the conditions to participate in the Panamerican Championships while she was attending the athletes' meeting after the Canadian championships, because these remarks had been translated. However, this does not put an end to the Respondent's obligation to use both official languages when issuing important communications to athletes. The mere fact that the information had already been conveyed in both official languages does not extinguish the obligation. The formal written reminder that an answer was expected by a certain date constitutes an important communication that must be issued in both official languages. Otherwise, only one group will benefit from the second communication and both official languages will be treated differently. That would be unfair.

42. The March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 e-mail is an important communication. The consequences that flow from it and provided by the Respondent clearly confirm its importance. An athlete who fails to respond will be removed from the national team for the 2010 Panamerican Senior Championships. High performance athletes train in order to participate in international competitions. This is clear from the document entitled "Competitions and Training for the National Senior Team" and provided to athletes by the Respondent. The 2010 Panamerican Senior Championships are included in the list of competitions. If the goal of training for an athlete on the national team is to participate in international games, it follows that all communications dealing with the conditions of participation are important communications. Otherwise, training is no longer a means to an end, but rather an end in itself. Because notice of the conditions of participation for a competition are an important communication emanating from the Respondent, they must conform to its Language Policy.

43. In order to avoid any ambiguity about what I am saying, I repeat that it was not the Claimant's duty to request clarification of the March 23<sup>rd</sup> email sent to her in English only. The effect of such a duty would be to shift the obligation to disclose the creation of the obligation from the obligor — in this case the Respondent — to the obligee — in this case the Claimant. It is not the Claimant's responsibility to ask someone to translate important English-only e-mails from the Respondent. It is rather the Respondent's duty to clearly communicate—in this case to communicate clearly is to communicate in French—to the Claimant her obligation to respond by a specific date.

44. This is the manner in which the Respondent's Language Policy should be interpreted. The Respondent cannot disregard it when it becomes inconvenient. It is precisely when practical difficulties arise that the Language Policy takes on its full importance and scope. The obligation to serve a person in his/her official language is not a trivial one, because language is the means by which a person accesses these services.

45. The Respondent chose to convey the creation of the obligation to respond by a certain date using an official language other than that of the Claimant's. That did not comply with the obligations arising from its Language Policy, nor did it meet the expectations created from its past practice when seeking athletes to participate in high level competitions. Finally, the Claimant's proficiency in English has no bearing on the Respondent's obligation to comply with its Language Policy.

### **Decision**

46. The appeal is granted. I order Karate Canada to include Maude L'Écuyer Lafleur on the national team that will participate in the 2010 Panamerican Senior Championships.

47. The Affected Party requested the opportunity to make submissions on costs. The parties have until June 21, 2010 to file written submissions on costs.

DATED at the City of Greater Sudbury (Ontario), this 25<sup>th</sup> day of May 2010.

"Henri Pallard"

---

Henri R. PALLARD  
Arbitrator