

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

**IN THE MATTER OF AN ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATION ASSERTED BY SPORT
INTEGRITY CANADA**

Citation: Sport Integrity Canada v. Dhesi, 2026 CASDRC 29

File No: SDRCC DT 25-0384

Date: 2026-06-09

DOPING TRIBUNAL

BETWEEN:

SPORT INTEGRITY CANADA

-and-

WRESTLING CANADA LUTTE (“WCL”)

(PARTIES)

AND

AMARVEER SINGH DHESI

(PARTY)

AND

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA
WORLD ANTI-DOPING AGENCY (WADA)

(OBSERVERS)

Correction Notice:

Corrected on June 26, 2026 pursuant to Subsection 5.7(j)
of the 2025 Canadian Sport Dispute Resolution Code.

Appearances:

On behalf of Sport Integrity Canada:	Adam Donaldson and Luisa Ritacca, Counsel
On behalf of Amarveer Dhesi:	Joven Narwal K.C. and Joshua Wandler, Counsel
On behalf of WCL:	Tamara Medwidsky

I. Overview

1. Amarveer Singh Dhese (the “Athlete”) is an athlete in the sport of freestyle wrestling. He has represented Canada at two Olympic Games, the Commonwealth Games and many other international competitions. He is currently employed as a police officer with the Vancouver Police Department.
2. On September 11, 2025, Sport Integrity Canada asserted an anti-doping rule violation (“ADRV”) against the Athlete. Specifically, Sport Integrity Canada asserted that the Athlete missed three whereabouts tests, in contravention of Rule 2.4 of the Canadian Anti-Doping Program (“CADP”) and sought a two-year period of ineligibility. The Athlete refused to accept the ADRV and proposed consequences, and the matter was referred to the Doping Tribunal.
3. On May 25, 2026, I issued my decision to deny the Athlete’s appeal, with reasons to follow, in accordance with Section 7.9 of the *Code* and CADP Rule 8.3.1. These are my reasons.

II. Jurisdiction

4. The Sport Dispute Resolution Center of Canada (“SDRCC”) was created March 19, 2003, by the *Physical Activity and Sport Act* (S.C. 2003, c.2). Under the *Act*, the SDRCC has exclusive jurisdiction to provide a national alternative dispute resolution service to the sport community.

A. *The Code and the Canadian Anti-Doping Program*

5. The World Anti-Doping Agency (“WADA”) is the international organization responsible for administering the World Anti-Doping Program (“WADP”), which includes the World Anti-Doping Code (“WADC”).
6. Sport Integrity Canada (which, until November 25, 2025, operated as Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport) is an independent, not-for-profit organization that is responsible for administering the CADP, including the provision of anti-doping services to national sport organizations and their members.
7. The CADP applies to all members of, and participants in, the activities of sporting organizations adopting it. Wrestling Canada Lutte (WCL) is the official governing body for the sport of wrestling in Canada. WCL has adopted the CADP.
8. The SDRCC has the jurisdiction to constitute and administer a Doping Tribunal, which is obliged to conduct all hearings in accordance with the CADP Rules as informed, where necessary, by the WADC (Rules 8.1.1 and 13.2.2 of the CADP) and mandatory International Standards.
9. Parties to a proceeding before the Anti-Doping Tribunal are the athlete or other person against whom Sport Integrity Canada asserts an anti-doping rule violation, Sport Integrity Canada and the relevant sport organization. WADA and the Government of Canada may attend the hearing as observers if they wish (CADP Rule 8.2.3).

10. Neither WADA nor the Government of Canada participated as observers.

III. Procedural History

11. On December 3, 2025, I was selected under subsection 5.3 (b) of the *Canadian Sport Dispute Resolution Code* (the “Code”) to decide this matter. On April 9, 2026, during these proceedings, the Athlete admitted committing an ADRV. The sole remaining issue was that of the appropriate consequences for that violation.
12. I conducted an oral hearing by the electronic platform Zoom on April 28, 2026 where the Athlete and Kevin Bean, Executive Director, Anti-Doping of Sport Integrity Canada were cross-examined on their affidavit evidence. Final submissions were made in writing.

IV. The Whereabouts Regime

13. The athlete whereabouts program requires athletes in the registered testing pool (“RTP”) to submit timely and accurate information about their Whereabouts for every day in a forthcoming quarter, including for a defined 60-minute period each day, for the purpose of locating them for no-notice out-of-competition testing. (CADP Rule 5.5) Athletes are obliged to update that information as necessary to ensure that it remains accurate and complete at all times. (CADP Rule 5.5.4.(b)) They may do that by several means, including on the ADAMS (the online management system for athletes to notify Sport Integrity Canada of the required information) website, using the Athlete Central App, by email, or by calling Sport Integrity Canada.
14. Rule 2.4 of the CADP provides that “Any combination of three (3) missed tests and/or filing failures, as defined in the *International Standard for Results Management*, within a twelve (12) month period by an *Athlete in a Registered Testing Pool*” constitutes an anti-doping rule violation.
15. For the purposes of Rule 2.4, an *Athlete’s* failure to comply with the requirements of the *International Standard for Testing and Investigations* shall be deemed a filing failure or a missed test, as defined in Annex B of the *International Standard for Results Management (ISRM)*, where the conditions set forth in Annex B are met. (Rule 5.5.5). If an athlete does not submit their whereabouts information quarterly, they may receive a “Filing Failure.” A “Filing Failure” is defined in the ISRM as:
- ...a failure by the Athlete ... to make an accurate and complete Whereabouts Filing that enables the Athlete to be located for Testing at the times and locations set out in the Whereabouts Filing or to update the Whereabouts Filing where necessary to ensure it remains accurate and complete.*
16. Furthermore, it is presumed that an athlete’s failure to file Whereabouts information is negligent, a presumption that may only be rebutted by the Athlete establishing that no negligent behaviour on their part caused or contributed to the failure (ISRM Article B.2.1.(d))
17. If an athlete cannot be located by a Doping Control Officer (“DCO”) at the address identified in ADAMS during the 60-minute time slot, this may result in a “Missed Test.” The ISRM defines a Missed Test as:

...a failure by the Athlete to be available for Testing at the location and time specified in the 60-minute time slot identified in their Whereabouts Filing for the day in question.

18. Pursuant to ISRM Article B 2.4 (e), it is presumed that an athlete's failure to be available for Testing at the specified location during the specified 60-minute time slot is negligent. As with Article B.2.1. the presumption may only be rebutted by evidence that no negligent behaviour on the athlete's part caused or contributed to their failure to be available for Testing at such location during the time slot and/or to update their most recent Whereabouts Filing to give notice of a different location instead of the original location.
19. The ISRM defines both a Missed Test and a Filing Failure as "whereabouts failures."
20. Finally, an *Athlete* in Sport Integrity Canada's *Registered Testing Pool* shall continue to be subject to the obligation to comply with the whereabouts requirements set in the *International Standard for Testing and Investigations* unless and until:
 - a) the *Athlete* gives written notice to Sport Integrity Canada that he or she has retired, or
 - b) Sport Integrity Canada has informed him or her that he or she no longer satisfies the criteria for inclusion in Sport Integrity Canada's *Registered Testing Pool*. (Rule 5.5.6)
21. The whereabouts regime is a fundamental means to detect doping practices in sport. While onerous, the regime enables the testing authority to locate athletes for unannounced out-of-competition testing, which is crucial to the fight against doping and to allow athletes to claim with credibility that they are subject to testing at any time so that the public can have confidence that the athletes are clean. (*World Athletics v. Salwa Eid Naser* CAS 2020/A/7526 & CAS 2020/A/7559 at para. 211, and *Christian Coleman v. World Athletics*, CAS 2020/A/7528, para. 162 b.)

V. Whereabouts Failures

22. The Athlete did not dispute his inclusion in Sport Integrity Canada's RTP nor did he dispute Sport Integrity Canada's assertion of an ADRV following the recording of three Whereabouts Failures in a 12-month period.
23. Those Whereabouts Failures are as follows.

A. *First Whereabouts Failure – October 1, 2024*

24. The Athlete did not submit a complete whereabouts submission for the October – December 2024 quarter by the September 30, 2024 deadline.
25. On October 21, 2024, Sport Integrity Canada sent the Athlete an Apparent Filing Failure letter notifying him of his failure to submit complete whereabouts information by September 30, 2024 and giving him until October 23, 2024 to do so, as well as to provide a written explanation why the whereabouts information had not been submitted by September 30, 2024. The Athlete's Whereabouts information was submitted on October 21, 2024, but the Athlete did not provide any explanation for his failure to submit that information by September 30, 2024.

26. On November 5, 2024, Sport Integrity Canada issued a Determination letter to the Athlete stating that the Whereabouts Failure would be maintained and advised him of the right to request an administrative review by November 12, 2024.
27. The Athlete did not seek an administrative review of this decision and Sport Integrity Canada recorded a Filing Failure pursuant to ISRM Annex B.3.2.e.

B. Second Whereabouts Failure- January 1, 2025

28. The Athlete did not provide a complete whereabouts submission for the January – March 2025 quarter by the December 31, 2024 deadline. His complete whereabouts information was submitted on January 4, 2025.
29. On January 21, 2025, Sport Integrity Canada sent the Athlete an Apparent Filing Failure letter notifying him of his apparent filing failure and provided him with an opportunity to provide a written explanation about why his complete whereabouts information had not been submitted by the deadline. Sport Integrity Canada noted that this was the Athlete's second Whereabouts Failure during the past 12 months and reminded him that any combination of three Whereabouts Failures in a rolling 12-month period may result in an ADRV.
30. The Athlete did not respond to Sport Integrity Canada's correspondence by the deadline of January 28, 2025.
31. On February 12, 2025, Sport Integrity Canada issued a Determination letter indicating that the Whereabouts Failure would be maintained, and informed the Athlete of his right to request an administrative review by February 19, 2025. In that correspondence, Sport Integrity Canada informed the Athlete that he had two Whereabouts Failures in the previous 12 months, and cautioned him that any combination of three Whereabouts Failures – whether through Missed Tests and/or Filing Failures – may result in an ADRV.
32. The Athlete did not request an administrative review of Sport Integrity Canada's decision to record a Second Whereabouts Failure.

C. Third Whereabouts Failure – February 22, 2025

33. The Athlete's Whereabouts Filings indicated that he would be at his home address in Surrey, British Columbia on February 22, 2025 at his designated 60-minute time slot (from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.)
34. On February 22, 2025, a Doping Control Officer ("DCO") attempted to test the Athlete at his home address. At 11:00 a.m., the DCO arrived at the identified location and was greeted by the Athlete's father. The Athlete's father informed the DCO that the Athlete was in Las Vegas for a holiday. The DCO remained at the location for 60 minutes, and at 11:55 a.m., he telephoned the phone number identified by the Athlete in his Whereabouts information. The phone number was the Athlete's home number and was answered by the Athlete's mother. The Athlete's mother informed the DCO that the Athlete was not at home and provided another telephone number. The DCO called the other phone number but no one answered.

35. Following the Missed Test on February 22, 2025, Sport Integrity Canada informed the Athlete that he could accept the Missed Test or provide an explanation why he was not available for the test, “along with any evidence or documents upon which [he] seek[s] to rely to demonstrate to [Sport Integrity Canada] that [his] Whereabouts Failure was not a result of [his] negligence.” The Athlete was given a deadline of March 10, 2025 to provide that explanation.

36. On March 9, 2025, the Athlete responded to the notification, explaining that he had made a mistake:

...understand that I am human and mistakes happen, I understand my obligations as a Canadian athlete. I have never tried to avoid a test, I have been apart of the doping control program for over 10 years, not once have I had a positive test. I will try and do better in the future. [reproduced as written]

37. The Athlete explained that on February 22, 2025, he was in Las Vegas for a personal trip and forgot to update his whereabouts information. The Athlete attached a copy of his flight booking information and continued:

I sincerely regret this oversight and acknowledge my responsibility in ensuring my whereabouts information is accurate at all times. This was an honest mistake and not an attempt to evade doping control.

...

I sincerely apologize for this oversight and respectfully request that CCES consider my explanation and supporting documents in evaluating my case. I understand the importance of compliance and remain fully committed to meeting my obligations.

38. On March 27, 2025, after evaluating the Athlete’s response, Sport Integrity Canada recorded a Missed Test and notified the Athlete of his right to request an administrative review by April 3, 2025.

39. On March 31, 2025, the Athlete requested an administrative review. His request stated, in part:

I would like to reiterate that I take my responsibilities as a high-performance athlete very seriously. I have proudly represented Canada on the international stage, including competing in two Olympic Games and have been a dedicated member of the Canadian national wrestling team for over 10 years. Throughout my career, I have always complied with anti-doping regulations and have never failed or actively avoided a test. I fully support clean sport and recognize the importance of the Whereabouts program.

40. After referring to some of his negative sample tests, the Athlete repeated his regret for his failure to update his whereabouts information before his trip to Las Vegas. He continued:

*I take full responsibility for my oversight and have already implemented stricter measures, including setting multiple reminders and routinely cross-checking my schedule in ADAMS before any travel. Additionally, to further educate myself and ensure future compliance, I have reviewed the **Registered Testing Pool and Athlete***

Whereabouts Program e-learning module. *This has reinforced my understanding of my obligations and the importance of accurate Whereabouts filings.*

41. The Athlete requested an administrative review of the Missed Test:

I would appreciate the opportunity for further consideration of this matter, particularly in light of my long-standing compliance history, commitment to anti-doping efforts, and representation of Canada at the highest level of competition. If any additional documentation or clarification is required, I am more than willing to provide it.

42. Sport Integrity Canada engaged an independent third-party to conduct a review of the February 22, 2025 Missed Test. The third-party administrative review concluded that the Third Whereabouts Failure should remain recorded against the Athlete.
43. On April 30, 2025, Sport Integrity Canada notified the Athlete of the administrative review, confirming the Whereabouts Failure.
44. The Missed Test constituted the Third Whereabouts Failure recorded against the Athlete in a 12-month period; that is, between October 2024 and February 2025.
45. On June 3, 2025, Sport Integrity Canada notified Wrestling Canada Lutte and the Athlete that it may pursue an ADRV against the Athlete for the three Whereabouts Failures. The Athlete was advised to submit any information he might have that undermined the validity of the Whereabouts Failures by June 10, 2025.
46. The Athlete sought, and was granted, several extensions of time to respond to Sport Integrity Canada's letter. On August 7, 2025, Counsel for the Athlete wrote to Sport Integrity Canada explaining that the missed test of February 22, 2025 was the result of his failure to update his whereabouts information before attending his bachelor's party in Las Vegas.
47. On September 11, 2025, Sport Integrity Canada reviewed the Athlete's explanations regarding the circumstances of his Whereabouts Failures and concluded that the explanations did not justify Sport Integrity Canada exercising any apparent discretion to "take no further action." Sport Integrity Canada wrote that, notwithstanding the Athlete's explanations, he had not provided "any argument or evidence that demonstrates that any of the three whereabouts failures should not have been recorded" against him. Sport Integrity Canada informed the Athlete that it maintained its ADRV against him and proceeded with a Notice of Charge under Rule 2.4 of the CADP.
48. I am comfortably satisfied that the October 21, 2024 and the January 21, 2025 Filing Failures and the February 22, 2025 Missed Test constitute Whereabouts Failures. I find that the Athlete violated CADP Rule 2.4, a finding he does not dispute.

VI. The Applicable Sanction

49. The CADP specifies a period of ineligibility of 2 years for a violation of Rule 2.4, subject to a reduction down to a minimum of one year, depending on the Athlete's degree of Fault. (CADP Rule 10.3.2) The burden is on the Athlete to demonstrate that his degree of Fault warrants a lower period of ineligibility than the presumptive 2-year period.

50. The CADP defines “Fault” as:

Fault is any breach of duty or lack of care appropriate to a particular situation. Factors to be taken into consideration in assessing an Athlete or other Person’s degree of Fault include, for example the Athlete’s or other Person’s experience, whether the Athlete or other Person is a Protected Person, special considerations such as impairment, the degree of risk that should have been perceived by the Athlete and the level of care and investigation exercised by the Athlete in relation to what should have been the perceived level of risk. In assessing the Athlete’s or other Person’s degree of Fault, the circumstances considered must be specific and relevant to explain the Athlete’s or other Person’s departure from the expected standard of behaviour. ...

51. Factors relevant to the assessment of Fault include the athlete’s experience in the RTP, their awareness of existing failures at the time of the third failure, the level of care and investigation exercised by the Athlete in relation to what should have been the perceived level of risk, any genuine technical impediments and the overall pattern of the failures. (CADP Appendix 1)

VII. SUBMISSIONS

A. Athlete

52. The Athlete says that, in 2022, recognizing the need to plan on a life beyond competitive wrestling, he enrolled in the Vancouver Police Department’s (“VPD”) cadet training program. He says that the program required intense preparation, physical and mental discipline and commitment. He took a leave of absence from the training to compete at the 2024 Olympic Games.

53. Following the Olympic Games, the Athlete began full-time active duty as a constable with the VPD and has been working full-time as a police officer ever since. He said that the work often requires long night shifts, which interfered with his sleep schedule, making it harder for him to feel rested and function normally during the day. He also said that, while working as a police officer, he was exposed several times to highly stressful situations that impacted his physical and mental state.

54. The Athlete said that the stress, combined with the difficulties adjusting to working night shifts, “caused significant strain on [his] cognitive and emotional reserves during the relevant times of all three whereabouts failures.”

55. The Athlete also said that he became engaged in 2024, and after returning from the Olympics, he was “actively involved in the planning” of his wedding, which, in the Punjabi Sikh community of which he is a part, “are a complex and deep cultural activity that involved months of detailed preparation and multiple ceremonies.”

56. In addition to working full time as a police officer and planning his wedding, the Athlete said that he was volunteering with wrestling clubs in the community.

57. The Athlete asserted that “the period of time in which all three whereabouts failures occurred was the most emotionally and cognitively exhausting time in [his] life.” With

respect to the first and second whereabouts failures, the Athlete contended that he “inadvertently forgot” to submit his whereabouts filings and said that “both of these failures were an honest mistake.”

58. The Athlete further contended that given that he was not actively competing and considering retirement during this period, his attention was not as attuned to his obligations within the anti-doping system as it had been when he was competing at a high level. He says that, after receiving his Apparent Filing Failure letter on October 21, 2024, he “immediately corrected [his] mistake” and submitted his whereabouts information, as he likewise did on January 4, 2025.
59. The Athlete repeated his explanation for his failure to update his whereabouts information on February 22, 2025.
60. The Athlete stated that, upon learning that a doping control officer visited his residence while he was in Las Vegas at his bachelor’s party, he “immediately felt a strong sense of dread and panic,” and, like the first two whereabouts failures, this missed test was completely inadvertent.”
61. Finally, the Athlete contends that he has a long history of negative tests, that there is no evidence he has never evaded testing and that he has never tested positive for banned substances, all of which evidence a lack of intent and support a reduced sanction.
62. The Athlete submitted several letters of reference speaking to his character and integrity, including one from the High-Performance Director of WCL.
63. The Athlete argues that the period of ineligibility should be reduced to one year based on a degree of fault that “falls at the very lowest end of the scale.” The Athlete relies on *Coleman v. World Athletics* (CAS 2020/A/7528), *USADA v. Rollins* (American Arbitration Association AAA 01-17-001-3244) *USADA v. Davis* (AAA 77-190-00587-13) and *USADA v. Kanak Jha* (AAA 01-22-0005-2588) in seeking a period of ineligibility of 12 months.

B. Sport Integrity Canada

64. Sport Integrity Canada submits that the Athlete’s fault is significant and that there should be no reduction to the default period of ineligibility.
65. Sport Integrity Canada submits, in summary, that not only has the Athlete accepted responsibility for the Missed Test, he failed to provide any information in relation to his two Filing Failures, despite multiple requests for him to do so.
66. Sport Integrity Canada noted that the Athlete incurred five previous Whereabouts Failures dating back to 2021, those being filing failures on April 21 2021, September 15, 2022, January 1, 2023 and January 1, 2024, and a missed test on August 31, 2021, demonstrating a continued pattern of failing to file his whereabouts information. Sport Integrity Canada further noted that the Athlete provided no explanation for the filing failures of April 21, 2021, September 15, 2022, January 1, 2023 or January 1, 2024 or the missed test on August 31, 2021.

VIII. ANALYSIS

67. The WADC and, by extension, the CADP, are designed to protect the integrity of sport and the rights of clean athletes. Absent exceptional circumstances, the SDRCC should follow Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) interpretations of provisions of the CADP when called upon to apply the same provision in cases under the CADP to achieve the consistency and harmonization that are the main objectives of the CADP. (*Hipperdinger v. ATP*, CAS 2004/A/690, *FINA v. Cielo Filho & CBCA*, CAS 2011/A/2495)
68. Fault is assessed having regard to all three whereabouts failures in combination, not in isolation. (*Naser*, and *World Anti-Doping Agency v. Russian Anti-Doping Agency & Ilya Bogatryev* CAS 2022/A/8895 at. Para 121)
69. I have considered the following factors in assessing the Athlete's level of fault:
70. Having Olympic and Commonwealth Games experience, the Athlete can be considered an elite athlete. He has been in the RTP and completed extensive anti-doping training dating back to 2018 and has been tested on over 30 occasions. In 2025, he completed the "Registered Testing Pool and Athlete Whereabouts Program (2025)" course. In his explanation for the third Whereabouts Failure (the Missed Test), the Athlete expressly acknowledged his anti-doping obligations.
71. Described by his counsel as "a future Hall of Famer" the Athlete is highly regarded in the wrestling community.
72. The Athlete is 30 years old and has successfully completed training to become a member of the Vancouver Police Department. There is no evidence he faced any language or technological impediments to meeting his whereabouts obligations.
73. The Athlete was repeatedly reminded of his obligation to file his whereabouts information in advance of each of the two filing failures and, following the filing failures, given the opportunity to outline any circumstances that might explain the missed tests. The Athlete did not provide any explanation for the failure to submit his whereabouts information before the deadline, nor did he seek a review of the Notification of the Filing Failure even after being notified of the consequences of missed tests.
74. Although the Athlete contended that there was no evidence that he received the reminder letters I find it more likely than not that Sport Integrity Canada sent the correspondence in the normal course of business. The Athlete received all the other communication from Sport Integrity Canada, including the opportunity to seek an administrative review. In any event, the responsibility for meeting whereabouts obligations rests with the Athlete and the Athlete cannot claim that he did not receive reminders to comply with his anti-doping obligation as a basis for reducing a sanction.
75. The Athlete offered several explanations for his failure to submit his whereabouts information before the deadline and provided those only after being notified that Sport Integrity Canada was asserting an ADRV. Those ranged from "inadvertence" to "mistakes," and later to a claim that his mind was "fully preoccupied" with a combination of work and planning for his wedding, and volunteering as a coach and mentor, which led to "emotional and cognitive exhaustion." In my view, the filing failures demonstrate that the Athlete appeared to have a dismissive approach to submitting his whereabouts information, rather than taking his anti-doping obligations seriously.

76. I am not persuaded that the Athlete's physical and emotional demands are a satisfactory explanation for his failure to file his whereabouts information on time, or, significantly, to seek an administrative review of Sport Integrity Canada's decision to record the two Filing Failures against him. The Athlete did not inform Sport Integrity Canada that he had any life stresses, such as an impending wedding or his obligations as a police officer, to explain the filing failures, when invited to do so. In the absence of any response or explanation until the hearing, I find that the Athlete failed to discharge the presumption that he was negligent on both occasions. In my view, the Athlete did not exercise the level of care in relation to what should have been the perceived level of risk. This supports a finding of significant Fault.
77. The Athlete also explained that the failure to update his whereabouts in advance of the February 22, 2025 test was due to an "administrative oversight." This conflicts with his explanation during cross-examination at the hearing, that "in [his] mind, he was no longer competing," suggesting that complying with the whereabouts regime was not a priority for him. That attitude, in my mind, is reinforced by his pattern of whereabouts failures between 2021 and 2024, some of which time the Athlete was neither a police officer nor planning a wedding. The Athlete acknowledged the fact that he no longer intended to compete does not relieve the Athlete of his anti-doping obligations.
78. I find that the Athlete failed to exercise the level of care and attention in relation to the risk of subsequent filing failures, and, in particular, after the October 21, 2024 filing failure.
79. Having knowledge of the CADP, and having two Filing Failures registered against him, the Athlete ought to have been on "high alert" to not have a third failure. (*Coleman*, para 184) Having asserted that he was aware of his anti-doping obligations, the Athlete would have been aware that a "third strike" would have resulted in the assertion of an ADRV. I am not satisfied that, as an experienced athlete, the Athlete exercised the level of care in relation to what should have been the perceived level of risk.
80. The Athlete's explanations about his three Whereabouts failures focus primarily on the circumstances of the third missed test, without any satisfactory explanation for his complete failure to respond to Sport Integrity Canada's reminders or to seek administrative reviews of the Filing Failures. Given the Athlete's history of filing failures, I find, contrary to his March 31 correspondence seeking an administrative review, that he placed other matters, including his volunteer coaching duties, above his anti-doping obligations.
81. I find that the Athlete has not provided any circumstances that would explain his departure from the expected standard of behaviour. To the contrary, the Athlete acknowledged that, despite his over 10 years in the RTP, his regular training regarding his anti-doping obligations, reminder letters and history of filing failures, he failed to explain his failures, took no apparent steps to attempt to correct those failures and did not "turn his mind" to his anti-doping obligations, appearing to prioritize other matters in his life. I am not persuaded that the stressors in the Athlete's life constitute mitigating factors justifying a reduced sanction.
82. Three of the cases relied upon by the Athlete in seeking a sanction of 12 months involve decisions of a Panel of the American Arbitration Association ("AAA"). While of some relevance, I do not consider them either binding or persuasive.

83. In *Rollins*, a 2017 decision, the Panel reduced the athlete's sanction for three whereabouts failures to 18 months, based in part on the athlete's "drug-free record," the fact that, in the Panel's view, the athlete showed no intention to cheat, and that the incidents were "inadvertent" due, in part, to confusion with the ADAMS system. In arriving at its conclusion, the Panel noted that the athlete's national sport governing body did not assist the athlete to comply with her anti-doping obligations. I do not find this case helpful to the Athlete. Unlike *Rollins*, the Athlete was sent repeated reminders by Sport Integrity Canada to complete his whereabouts information and despite these reminders, still failed to meet his obligations. Furthermore, this decision was expressly not followed in *Athletics Integrity Unit v. Newman*, (26 April 2026) where the Panel determined that "the whereabouts system is designed specifically to account for circumstances which fall outside of a normal routine, including to accommodate changes to an Athlete's Whereabouts information in ADAMS up until immediately before the Athlete's designated 60-minute time slot." (para. 57)
84. In *Kanak Jha*, the athlete was charged with an ADRV following three missed tests. On each occasion, the athlete was not present at the location identified in his whereabouts information when a DCO attempted to locate him. In reducing the sanction to 12 months, the Panel relied on the fact that the athlete attempted to be diligent in his filings and to have corrected his whereabouts for the relevant 60-minute window before learning of the third missed test. The Panel also relied upon the decision in *Coleman*, finding that it was reasonable for the athlete to have expected a telephone call within the 60-minute testing window. I find the circumstances of this case to be significantly different from those before me and decline to follow the reasoning.
85. I also decline to follow the case of *USADA v. Davis*, a 2014 decision relied upon by the Athlete. The athlete did not appear at the hearing but the evidence before the Panel was that he had experienced a death in his family, was looking for a job and, having not qualified for the US Olympic team, he was contemplating retiring. USADA proposed a 12-month suspension which the Panel agreed with. Not only are the circumstances unique, but the sanction decision is also fundamentally inconsistent with CAS cases. In *Pramod Bhagat v. BWF* (CAS 2024/A/10440), the Panel held that "it is evident that the very lowest level of Fault for all three Whereabouts Failures in totality must be established in order to justify the maximum reduction in sanction." (para. 336)
86. I find, considering all the circumstances, that the Athlete's degree of fault to be significant, and that there is no basis to depart from the 24-month period of ineligibility.
87. The period of ineligibility shall start on the date that this decision is issued. The period of provisional suspension served by the Athlete (that is, from March 31, 2026) shall be credited against the total period of ineligibility
88. The Athlete has not competed during the relevant period and there are therefore no results to be considered for disqualification.

SUMMARY

89. I conclude that:

- (i) The Athlete has committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation pursuant to Article 2.4 of the CADP;

A period of Ineligibility of 24 months is imposed upon the Athlete for the Anti-Doping Rule Violation, commencing on the date of this Decision;

- (ii) The Athlete is given credit for the period of Provisional Suspension from March 31, 2026 until the date of this Decision against the total period of Ineligibility; and
- (iii) There is no order as to costs.

90. This decision may be appealed to the CAS by the parties according to Rule 13 of the CADP and its subsections.

CONCLUSION

91. The appeal is denied.

92. I wish to thank counsel for their helpful submissions.

DATED: June 9, 2026, Vancouver, British Columbia

Carol Roberts, Arbitrator