

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

Nº: SDRCC 25-0780

**LYNDEN DOYON
(CLAIMANT)**

AND

**CYCLING CANADA CYCLISME (CCC)
(RESPONDENT)**

AND

**CHARLES ROFFI
(AFFECTED PARTY)**

Attendees at hearing:

For the Claimant: Edward Walsh

For the Respondent: Kris Westwood
Nigel Ellsay

Observers: Paul Singh
Jay Sengupta

Preliminary

1. This appeal relates to a team selection dispute in the sport of cycling.
2. The Claimant is a Canadian cyclist who seeks selection by Cycling Canada Cyclisme ("CCC") in the Junior Mens Tour de l'Abitibi project ("the Event").
3. The Respondent, CCC, is the national federation governing the sport of cycling, with its various disciplines, in Canada.

4. The Affected Party had been selected by CCC as part of the Canadian team for the Event and would, if the Claimant is successful in his appeal, be displaced as a member of the team.
5. I was appointed as Arbitrator in the matter on 10 July 2025 from the roster of arbitrators maintained by the Sport Dispute Resolution Centre of Canada (SDRCC). No issue has been raised regarding my appointment.
6. The matter is urgent. It was originally filed as a Med/Arb appeal, but no mediator was available, and it was transmogrified into a pure arbitration, in which a decision was required by noon on 12 July 2025.
7. Both the preliminary hearing and the tendering of evidence and written submissions occurred on 11 July 2025. The Affected Party was content to rely on CCC to speak to the issues that might concern him.
8. I issued a short decision dismissing the Claimant's appeal on 12 July 2025.
9. This constitutes my reasoned decision pursuant to the Canadian Sport Dispute Resolution Code ("Code").

The Substance of the Dispute

10. The Claimant states that the selection process for the Event is biased in its process of how the application period was available to athletes competing at the only road selection event and that CCC has put up a barrier to entry for athletes who perform to the level of warranting a national team spot at that event.
11. There is no suggestion (nor any evidence) of any personal bias directed at the Claimant.
12. The selection process was described by CCC. Given the great variety of programs, the various disciplines involved and age group considerations, there is a good deal of detail involved in the documentation. The selection process document (R-06) was given general circulation to the cycling community on 6 January 2025 and, *inter alia*, was posted on the CCC website. It had been shared with the CCC High Performance Committee as well as the Athletes Council for feedback before it was issued. Mechanically, a coaches panel of three (3) made recommendations regarding team selection for the Event to the CCC High Performance Committee.
13. The development process for the selection criteria appears to me to have been thorough and comprehensive.
14. The selection criteria contained deadlines within which athletes were to file their interest in participation and to file any requests or objections. The Claimant's coach had been specifically advised by the CCC of the relevant deadline. CCC kept records of such matters and did not consider Event-related applications or objections that were received after the expiry of the applicable deadline. This included those filed by the Claimant.

15. While the general policy regarding results-based requests contemplated a longer period following competitions to decide on filed requests or applications, the exigencies applicable to the Event were shorter, given the fast-approaching date of the competition. These delays were shorter, but nevertheless known in advance, so it was certainly possible to have filed within the remaining time available. Indeed, three applications (including that filed by the Affected Party) were received on the date of the competition.
16. CCC acknowledges that the applicable deadlines were, in the circumstances, short and that future selection criteria might, in respect of future iterations of the selection criteria, be adjusted accordingly.
17. On this occasion, however, CCC was bound to apply the rules then in effect, which it did. It would have been incorrect and inappropriate to have made an exception favouring an athlete who had not complied with the approved selection criteria, particularly when the application might have the effect of excluding a selected athlete who had complied with the approved and published rules.

Decision

18. In the circumstances, therefore, I cannot grant the relief sought by the Claimant. His claim is dismissed.
19. In closing, I wish to express my compliments and gratitude for the speed and professionalism with which these proceedings were instituted and conducted, as well as for the degree of civility exhibited by all participants.

Signed at Montreal, this 15th day of July 2025.

Richard W. Pound, CC, KC, Arbitrator