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

Citation : Sport Integrity Canada v. Sarrazin, 2026 CASDRC 9
No.: SDRCC DT 25-0378
Date: 2026-02-23

(DOPING TRIBUNAL)

SPORT INTEGRITY CANADA / CANADIAN CENTRE FOR ETHICS IN SPORT (CCES)

WEIGHTLIFTING CANADA HALTÉROPHILIE (WCH)
(Claimants)

AND

JONATHAN SARRAZIN
(Athlete)

AND

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA
WORLD ANTI-DOPING AGENCY (WADA)
(Observers)

Translation Notice:
This version is a translation of the original French version.

Amended Decision
This decision was issued on February 23, 2026 and amended on March 9, 2026. The amendments are underlined.

Before:

Patrice Brunet (Arbitrator)

Appearing:

Athlete's Representative: David Pinard (Counsel)

Sport Integrity Canada representatives: Annie Bourgeois and Thomas Stelmazuk-Côté (Counsel)

WADA and the Government of Canada did not participate in the hearing.

REASONED DECISION (AMENDED)

I. JURISDICTION

1. The Sport Dispute Resolution Centre of Canada ("SDRCC") was created by federal Bill C-12, passed on March 19, 2003[1].

2. In accordance with Rule 8.1.1 of the CADP, the Doping Tribunal is the SDRCC, which shall constitute and administer the Doping Panel.

3. Pursuant to section 10 of the *Physical Activity and Sport Act*, the SDRCC has exclusive jurisdiction to provide the sport community with a national alternative dispute resolution service, in particular those between sport organizations and their members.

4. All the Parties have agreed to recognize the SDRCC's jurisdiction in the present case.

II. INTRODUCTION

5. This arbitration concerns the decision by Sport Integrity Canada (formerly, the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport ("CCES")) alleging that Jonathan Sarrazin (the "Athlete") committed an anti-doping rule violation ("ADRV") under the Canadian Anti-Doping Program ("CADP").

6. Sport Integrity Canada submits that the Athlete committed an ADRV as defined in CADP Rule 2.1.2 due to the confirmed presence of a prohibited substance in his urine sample ("A Sample"), as proven by consistent testing of a second sample ("B Sample").

7. The Athlete does not expressly deny the presence of the prohibited substance detected in his sample as defined in CADP Rule 2.1.2. The Athlete claims that the adverse analytical

[1] *Physical Activity and Sport Act,* S.C. 2003, c. 2.

finding was due to contamination and that he did not intentionally consume a prohibited substance. However, he has indicated that he is unable to identify the source.

8. The Athlete expressly claims that the alleged violation was unintentional, an argument that suggests he was seeking to avoid the application of the four (4) year period of ineligibility.

9. Sport Integrity Canada submits that the Tribunal must impose the full four (4) year period of ineligibility as set out in CADP Rule 10.2.1.1.

III. BACKGROUND

10. The Athlete is a Canadian weightlifter under Weightlifting Canada Haltérophilie ("WCH"), the national sport organization and CADP signatory.

11. On August 17, 2024, the Athlete underwent a doping control as part of the CADP.

12. On September 17, 2024, the Athlete was informed of the result of the analysis of the A Sample, which revealed the presence of Ostarine SARM (S-22) ("Ostarine"), an anabolic agent on the Prohibited List of the World Anti-Doping Agency ("WADA"), classified as a non-specified substance.

13. The analysis of the B Sample, requested by the Athlete, also confirmed an adverse analytical finding for Ostarine.

14. As a result of this finding, Sport Integrity Canada alleged an ADRV as defined in CADP Rule 2.1.2.

15. In accordance with the findings in the short decision and for the reasons that will be stated below, the dispute does not pertain to the existence of the violation, but rather the determination and reasons for the applicable sanction under the CADP.

IV. THE PARTIES

16. Pursuant to CADP Rule 8.2.3, the parties to a proceeding before the Doping Tribunal are the Athlete or the other person against whom an ADRV is alleged, Sport Integrity Canada, and the relevant sport organization. The relevant international federation, WADA and the Government of Canada may attend the hearing as observers.

i. Sport Integrity Canada and WCH

17. Sport Integrity Canada, which is headquartered in Ottawa, Ontario, is the national anti-doping organization responsible for the adoption, administration and enforcement of anti-doping rules in Canada. As such, Sport Integrity Canada administers the CADP, conducts doping controls, and ensures results management.

18. WCH, which is headquartered in Ottawa, Ontario, is the national governing body for Olympic weightlifting in Canada. WCH is a signatory to the CADP and is bound by its rules, which apply to athletes under its jurisdiction.

ii. The Athlete

19. The Athlete is a Canadian weightlifter under WCH. As such, he is subject to CADP rules and the jurisdiction of the SDRCC Doping Tribunal.

iii. Observers: WADA and the Government of Canada

20. WADA, which is headquartered in Montreal, Quebec, is the international organization responsible for the administration, development and oversight of the CADP, including the World Anti-Doping Code and the International Standard for Laboratories ("ISL"). WADA did not participate in the hearing and made no representations.

21. The Government of Canada, also an observer under the CADP, did not participate in the hearing and made no representations.

V. FACTS NOT IN DISPUTE

22. On August 17, 2024, the Athlete provided an A Sample as part of a doping control at a weightlifting competition held in Saint-Hyacinthe, Quebec, in accordance with the CADP.

23. The Athlete's A Sample was analyzed by the doping control laboratory of the Institut national de la recherche scientifique, Centre Armand-Frappier (INRS), a laboratory accredited by WADA.

24. On September 17, 2024, the Athlete was informed that an adverse analytical finding had been reported for the A Sample collected on August 17, 2024, related to the presence of a non-specified substance, Ostarine, which is on the Prohibited List of the World Anti-Doping Agency in effect at the time of the occurrence, under class S1.2 – *Anabolic Agents – Other Anabolic Agents.*

25. In this notice, the Athlete was informed of his right to request an analysis of the B Sample.

26. On September 17, 2024, the same day, the Athlete confirmed wanting to proceed with the analysis and requested disclosure of the laboratory documentation related to his A Sample.

27. On October 18, 2024, Sport Integrity Canada informed the Athlete that the presence of the prohibited substance was confirmed in the B Sample analysis.

28. On February 14, 2025, Sport Integrity Canada issued a Notice of Charge to the Athlete alleging a violation of Rule 2.1.2 (ADRV) and indicating that the applicable presumptive sanction was a period of ineligibility of four (4) years, in accordance with CADP Rule 10.2.1.

VI. PROCEEDINGS

i. Preliminary steps and pre-hearing case preparation

29. On September 17, 2024, upon being notified of the adverse analytical finding, the Athlete sent an email to Sport Integrity Canada asking for a list of laboratories that could test his supplements and included a list of the products he was using.

30. On October 3, 2024, Sport Integrity Canada replied that the WADA-accredited laboratory in Montreal could conduct the analysis of the supplements, at the Athlete's expense, and requested confirmation of the exact number of products that he wanted to have tested along with an accurate identification of the supplements in question.

31. On October 18, 2024, Sport Integrity Canada reiterated this information and renewed its request for confirmation.

32. There is no evidence on file that the Athlete made a formal request for supplement analysis, despite follow-ups by Sport Integrity Canada, or that he provided a confirmation or provided samples to the laboratory.

33. On February 14, 2025, a Notice of Charge was sent to the Athlete regarding an alleged violation of CADP Rule 2.1.2.

34. The case was then opened before the SDRCC's Doping Tribunal under case number SDRCC DT 25-0378.

35. On February 27, 2025, the Parties participated in a resolution facilitation process via video conference. No settlement agreement was reached at the end of this process.

36. On March 25, 2025, the SDRCC confirmed my appointment as Arbitrator. I signed the required declaration of independence and statement of impartiality.

37. On April 15, 2025, a preliminary meeting was held between the Parties, the SDRCC representatives and myself to discuss the conduct of the proceedings, procedural issues and the establishment of a procedural timetable.

38. On April 18, 2025, the Athlete filed a challenge against me.

39. On April 21, 2025, I sent my submissions on this application, confirming my refusal to recuse myself.

40. On April 23, 2025, the Athlete filed a response to the Arbitrator's submissions.

41. On May 9, 2025, the Jurisdictional Arbitrator appointed by the SDRCC dismissed this application by way of a final and binding decision.

ii. Procedural orders and disclosure request

42. On May 23, 2025, following the preliminary meeting, a procedural order O-01 was issued to guide the rest of the proceedings, in particular regarding the timetable and treatment of the disclosure issues.

43. On June 16, 2025, the Athlete filed a request for disclosure of evidence, alleging that certain relevant documents had not been disclosed by Sport Integrity Canada and claiming that this situation jeopardized his ability to make full answer and defence.

44. On June 19, 2025, Sport Integrity Canada filed a written response to this request, claiming to have met all of its reporting obligations under CADP Rule 7 and the ISL for results management. In particular, Sport Integrity Canada stated having sent all relevant documents in its possession, including the certificates of analysis for the A and B Samples, the laboratory documentation package, the chain of custody and relevant communications, and that no omissions remained.

45. On June 30, 2025, through procedural order O-02 ("Order O-02"), I dismissed the disclosure motion after reviewing the Parties' written submissions. In that decision, I found

that the disclosure obligations under the CADP had been met and that no further action was required.

46. In that decision, I concluded, in particular, that:

- [translation] "[Sport Integrity Canada] has demonstrated that it provided the Athlete with all the documents in its possession addressing items II to VIII listed in paragraph 30 of the Request";
- [translation] "no evidence was submitted proving that Sport Integrity Canada has any other relevant information beyond the documents already provided to the Athlete";
- the repeated requests were akin to [translation] "an exploratory process with no apparent factual basis to justify additional disclosure";
- [translation] "under no circumstances does the ISL provide for the possibility of an athlete to request a counter-analysis in a laboratory of his or her choice," and therefore that "the Tribunal thus has no jurisdiction to order such a transfer of the sample to conduct a counter-analysis"; and
- The Tribunal also found that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms does not apply to the anti-doping proceedings conducted by Sport Integrity Canada, and therefore the Athlete's argument [translation] "based on the application of the Charter to justify the disclosure of the sample or technical documents cannot be accepted."

47. Order O-02 was issued on the basis of the written record. Pursuant to Section 5.7 of the Canadian Sport Dispute Resolution Code (the "Code"), the Panel has control over the proceedings and may determine the appropriate form to dispose of a request, when it considers that the record is complete and that the Parties have had an opportunity to present their positions. It was not deemed necessary to hold a separate hearing on the disclosure request.

iii. Written submissions and procedural calendar

48. On June 11, 2025, a procedural calendar was established and confirmed by procedural order O-03 ("Order O-03"), which included deadlines for written submissions and the disclosure of exhibits.

49. In accordance with the established procedural calendar:

- on July 18, 2025, the Athlete filed his written submissions;
- on August 1, 2025, Sport Integrity Canada filed its written submissions and all of its exhibits and authorities;
- on August 5, 2025, the Athlete's exhibits were produced; no additional authorities were filed.

50. The hearing on merits was originally scheduled for October 22, 2025, in accordance with the established procedural calendar.

51. On October 17, 2025, a request to postpone the hearing scheduled for October 22, 2025 was made by counsel for the Athlete due to personal circumstances. After receiving the Parties' submissions, the Tribunal ordered the hearing to be postponed to a later date, taking into account the principles of procedural fairness and expediency.

52. The hearing was reconvened on February 3, 2026.

iv. Witness management and Hearing

53. On July 18, 2025, in his written submissions, the Athlete indicated his intention to call three (3) witnesses.

54. On August 1, 2025, in its own written submissions, Sport Integrity Canada indicated that it intended to call one (1) witness if the evidence presented by the Athlete required it, while reserving the right to call additional witnesses in response to the Athlete's evidence.

55. On August 11, 2025, the Tribunal asked the Parties to provide by August 14, 2025 the list of witnesses they intended to call along with an estimate of the time required for the examination-in-chief.

56. On August 14, 2025, counsel for the Athlete provided a list of four (4) witnesses. On the same day, Sport Integrity Canada confirmed that it did not intend to call witnesses at this time, while reserving the right to call them in response to the Athlete's evidence.

57. On October 9, 2025, following the postponement of the hearing and the numerous changes to the procedural calendar, I asked the Parties to reconfirm their intention to call witnesses, and to clarify, for each one, the scope of the proposed testimony and the manner of appearance (in person or virtual), by October 16, 2025. No responses were received by the deadline.

58. On December 19, 2025, by Order O-03, the Tribunal asked the Parties to provide, no later than fourteen (14) days before the start of the hearing, a list of the witnesses they intended to call, together with a brief summary of the scope of the testimony and the manner of appearance. This order, endorsed by the Parties, expressly provided for the exchange of such lists. Sport Integrity Canada confirmed that it did not intend to call any witnesses unless the evidence presented by the Athlete required it. The Athlete did not submit a list of witnesses.

59. On January 30, 2026, noting that no witness list had been sent by the Athlete as per Order O-03, I concluded that none of the Parties intended to call witnesses at the hearing and I wrote to the Parties to confirm that the hearing would be held without any witnesses. No list was produced by the Athlete and no request was made to be relieved of this procedural defect. On the same day, the Athlete's representative took note of this decision.

60. The hearing on the merits was held in person on February 3, 2026 at the SDRCC in Brossard, Quebec. The Parties presented their arguments and answered the Tribunal's questions.

61. No witnesses were heard at the hearing. Counsel for Sport Integrity Canada specifically mentioned not objecting to the Athlete testifying if he wished to do so. However, counsel for the Athlete did not call the Athlete as a witness at the hearing.

v. Short decision

62. On February 9, 2026, I issued a short written decision in accordance with Subsection 7.9(a) of the Code and CADP Rule 8.3.1.

63. In that decision, I first concluded that the presence of Ostarine, a non-specified substance, was established by the certificates of analysis for the A & B Samples issued by the WADA-accredited laboratory. In accordance with CADP rules 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, these findings were deemed valid.

64. I then concluded that the Athlete had not demonstrated, on a balance of probabilities, the existence of a departure from the ISL or an irregularity in the chain of custody that could have caused an adverse analytical finding. Therefore, he did not overturn the presumption of validity attached to the laboratory results.

65. Consequently, I concluded that the ADRV, as defined in CADP Rule 2.1.2, was established. The only remaining issue was the determination of the applicable sanction.

66. I also concluded that the Athlete had not established the source of the prohibited substance or demonstrated that the violation was not intentional under CADP Rule 10.2.3. In the absence of such a demonstration, the conditions to exclude the application of the presumptive ineligibility period provided under CADP Rule 10.2.1.1 were not met.

67. As a result, the applicable ineligibility period was four (4) years. The detailed reasons for these findings are set out below.

VII. POSITION OF THE PARTIES

68. The Parties provided detailed written submissions and oral arguments at the hearing. All of their arguments have been reviewed.

i. Athlete's position

69. The Athlete submits that he has an exemplary record, marked by a history of compliance with anti-doping rules and immediate collaboration following notification of the adverse analytical finding of September 17, 2024 (para. 10, 12 and 16 of the Athlete's submissions).

70. He exercised his right to have the B Sample tested and requested relevant documentation in order to understand the reported findings.

71. In paragraph 1 of his submissions, the Athlete submits that, in view of Order O-02, attesting that Sport Integrity Canada had discharged its disclosure obligation, he is unable to benefit from a full answer and defence, notably due to the reversals of the burden of proof and his alleged inability to demonstrate a mitigating factor provided in the CADP.

72. At the hearing, the Athlete also alleged that Order O-02 was made without an oral hearing of his arguments or the benefit of a reply.

73. He made the hypothetical argument that the adverse analytical finding could be due to contamination and that, under these circumstances, the alleged violation should not be upheld.

74. He argued that the applicable system imposes an excessive burden of proof on the Athlete, which he believes would create an imbalance that is incompatible with the principles of fundamental justice.

75. He also stated that he did not have a real opportunity to have his supplements analyzed before the file became contentious and transferred to the SDRCC. He claimed that the steps taken did not allow for an independent analysis of the products consumed and mentioned his financial and family situation to account for his inability to retain the services of a private laboratory.

76. With respect to the chain of custody, the Athlete acknowledged that the collection kit was received by the laboratory, but argued that the documentation provided was not sufficient to adequately assess the possibility of contamination, what he calls a fundamental issue of justice.

77. On the merits, the Athlete claimed that he never intentionally consumed a prohibited substance. He claimed that he did not know the source of the Ostarine detected in his A Sample. He maintained that he was diligent in the selection and consumption of his supplements and did not knowingly consume anything in violation of the anti-doping rules.

78. The Athlete cited his impeccable track record and professional ethics, noting that he is a member of the Order of Chartered Professional Accountants and occupies a position requiring a high level of integrity, arguing that it would be inconsistent for him to take significant precautions for a prescribed drug while voluntarily consuming a prohibited substance. He said that he had conducted several searches of a prescribed drug, the nature of which is not specified in this decision, for privacy reasons, which he considered to be the only possible source of the non-negative result, and specified that no search related to Ostarine appear in his search history. He claimed to have been diligent in purchasing supplements from recognized Canadian brands and trusted outlets, stating that he was using the same products at the time of a negative control performed three months earlier.

79. Finally, he highlighted that the detected concentration of 0.09 picogram/mL is extremely low, that it would be compatible with contamination, and that in the absence of further testing it would be impossible to distinguish between a residual presence and contamination, adding that Ostarine remains in the body for a long time and that a doping cycle undertaken between two competitions likely to be tested would be highly improbable.

ii. Sport Integrity Canada's position

80. Sport Integrity Canada maintains that the ADRV is definitively established by the confirmed presence of Ostarine in the Athlete's A and B Samples, in accordance with CADP Rule 2.1.2.

81. As a result, Sport Integrity Canada submits that the violation is no longer in dispute, therefore the purpose of these proceedings is strictly limited to determining the applicable sanction.

82. Sport Integrity Canada recalls that according to CADP Rule 3.1, Sport Integrity Canada is responsible for establishing the ADRV, which it claims to have done by confirming the presence of Ostarine in the B Sample.

83. Sport Integrity Canada adds that the analytical methods approved by WADA are presumed to be scientifically sound (Rule 3.2.1) and that WADA-accredited laboratories are presumed to have performed the sample analysis and followed the custodial procedures in accordance with Rule 3.2.2. According to Sport Integrity Canada, it was therefore up to the Athlete to rebut these presumptions by demonstrating, on a balance of probabilities, a departure from the ISL and a reasonable causal link with the adverse analytical finding.

84. Sport Integrity Canada submits that, in this case, the Athlete indicates wanting to [translation] "challenge the chain of custody" without providing any supporting arguments or evidence, such that this challenge is unsubstantiated and amounts to speculation.

85. Sport Integrity Canada submits that Ostarine is a non-specified substance, classified as S1.2, and that the applicable system provides for an ineligibility period of four (4) years, unless the Athlete demonstrates that the violation was not intentional.

86. Sport Integrity Canada argues that that the Athlete has not proven, on a balance of probabilities, that there is no intent, nor has the source of the prohibited substance been identified, and that there are no exceptional circumstances that would warrant a reduction in the sanction.

87. In particular, Sport Integrity Canada emphasizes that the Athlete has admitted that the source remains unknown and that he does not establish any exceptional circumstances for allowing an analysis of intent despite the absence of evidence on the source.

88. Sport Integrity Canada also affirms that the Athlete is not entitled to a reduction in the sanction based on the absence of fault or negligence, or the absence of fault or significant

negligence, within the meaning of CADP Rules 10.4 to 10.6, in the absence of proof as to how the substance entered his body.

89. With respect to disclosure of evidence, Sport Integrity Canada submits that the matter was definitively resolved by Order O-02, which found that all relevant documents in its possession were disclosed, and that any claims to the contrary are incorrect.

90. In accordance with CADP Rules 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, the analyses performed by an accredited laboratory are deemed to be valid and compliant with the ISL. It was up to the Athlete to establish, through sufficient evidence, the existence of a discrepancy that might have caused the adverse analytical finding. No evidence to that effect was presented. Since the presumption was not reversed, the presence of the prohibited substance constitutes a violation of CADP Rule 2.1.

91. The violation having been established, the applicable suspension period is determined in accordance with CADP Rule 10.2.1, which is four (4) years, unless the Athlete proves that the violation was not intentional.

92. With regard to supplements, Sport Integrity Canada argues that it followed up with the Athlete three times in order to obtain the list of supplements he wanted analyzed. It refers in particular to the exchanges that took place following the notification of the adverse analytical finding of September 17, 2024, to the subsequent communications, including the transmission of the documentation package on October 3, 2024.

93. According to Sport Integrity Canada, the Athlete was informed that the supplements could be tested at his own expense by an accredited laboratory. However, Sport Integrity Canada maintains that no specific list of supplements was provided, no independent analysis was undertaken, and no formal request for analysis was made, including after the case was transferred to the SDRCC.

94. Sport Integrity Canada submits that there is no issue regarding the Athlete's right to be heard.

95. As a result, Sport Integrity Canada concludes that the ADRV has been established, that no evidence of a source of contamination has been submitted, and that the ineligibility period of four (4) years must be confirmed, with application of the consequences provided under the CADP.

VIII. ANALYSIS

96. The anti-doping system is based on a strict liability principle. It is therefore not necessary to prove the Athlete's intention, fault or negligence to conclude that a violation has occurred. In accordance with the short decision rendered on February 9, 2026, the presence of an non-specified substance (Ostarine) in the Athlete's sample constitutes a violation of CADP Rule 2.1.2. The ADRV has been established and the presumption of analysis validity has not been rebutted.

97. The following analysis follows a logical sequence established by the CADP and case law:

- I first consider the presumption of the validity of the analyses and the custodial procedures, as well as the possibility of the Athlete rebutting this presumption;
- In the absence of such a reversal, the presumptive sanction of four (4) years set out in CADP Rule 10.2.1 applies, unless the Athlete demonstrates, on a balance of probabilities, that the violation was not intentional;
- this demonstration assumes, except under special circumstances, that the Athlete has established the source of the prohibited substance;
- only then, if applicable, can the provisions relating to the absence of fault or negligence, or the absence of significant fault or negligence, be analyzed.

i. Presumption of validity of analyses and chain of custody

98. In accordance with CADP Rules 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, the results of the analyses performed by a WADA-accredited laboratory benefit from a presumption of validity. The onus is on the Athlete to prove, on a balance of probabilities, the existence of a discrepancy with the ISL that might have caused the adverse analytical finding.

99. The case law reproduced in Sport Integrity Canada's book of authorities confirms that, in order to establish the origin of a prohibited substance or rebut an applicable presumption, an athlete must present real and verifiable evidence, not mere assumptions or speculation; *WADA v. Robinson and JADCO*[2]: "an athlete must provide actual evidence as opposed to mere speculation."

100. Sport Integrity Canada's submissions also recall that the analysis of the A and B Samples was performed by the WADA-accredited INRS laboratory and that the B Sample confirmed the presence of Ostarine. Under CADP Rule 2.1.2, the ADRV is therefore established.

[2] *WADA v. Robinson and JADCO*, CAS 2014/A/3820

101. In the present case, the Athlete acknowledges that the collection kit was received by the accredited laboratory and that the analysis of his A and B Samples was completed. However, he submits that the documentation that was sent does not allow him to adequately assess the possibility of contamination or an irregularity in the chain of custody.

102. In his submissions, the Athlete indicates that he intends to challenge the chain of custody and specifies that his statements do not constitute an admission that Ostarine is present. However, he does not identify any specific departure from the ISL or any documented irregularities.

103. The Athlete has not identified any specific applicable departure from the ISL or any documented irregularities in the chain of custody, other than a simple parenthetical remark regarding the storage of a sample, a remark that has not been linked to any argument for non-compliance with the ISL. No independent evidence has been provided to prove a departure from the ISL.

104. As a result, the presumption of validity of the analyses remains intact and the ADRV is confirmed in accordance with CADP Rules 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

ii. Prior requirement to establish the source of the prohibited substance

105. The ADRV being established, the only issue concerns the applicable sanction.

106. CADP Rule 10.2.1.1 provides that a violation involving a non-specified substance will result in an ineligibility period of four (4) years, unless the Athlete proves that the violation was not intentional as defined in CADP Rule 10.2.3.

107. Leading case law establishes that, in order to analyze whether a violation was intentional, the athlete must first establish how the prohibited substance entered their body; in other words, identify the source of the unintentional contamination. Without such a demonstration, it is generally not possible to assess intent or to meaningfully examine the factors that may lead to a reduction in the sanction.

108. Indeed, this principle is expressly recognized in *CCES v. Youssef*[3], where the arbitrator upheld a suspension of four (4) years, noting that the onus is on the athlete to establish, on a balance of probabilities, how the prohibited substance was ingested.

[3] *CCES v. Youssef*, SDRCC DT 15-0225

109. This principle was also applied in *CCES v. Findlay*[4], where the Tribunal found that the Athlete failed to establish the exact source of the high testosterone levels that were detected, therefore the period of ineligibility had to be maintained.

110. In the present case, without further evidence to consider, and for the reasons set out below, the Athlete has not established how the Ostarine entered his body.

iii. Supplements, alleged contamination and lack of objective evidence

111. The Athlete has referred to "possible contamination." However, he does not clearly advance a specific thesis, nor does he provide any laboratory analysis of a specific supplement.

112. It appears from the record, as submitted by Sport Integrity Canada in its submissions, that steps were taken and the Athlete was recontacted to obtain the list of supplements that he wished to have analyzed or the samples that would enable an independent analysis to be done. Following notification of the adverse analytical finding on September 17, 2024, exchanges took place, notably on September 17, 2024, October 3, 2024 and October 18, 2024. A Notice of Charge was then issued by Sport Integrity Canada on February 14, 2025.

113. Despite these exchanges and the opportunities raised by the Athlete to have the supplements analyzed at his expense, no specific list of supplements was provided by the Athlete and no independent product analysis was submitted as evidence, including after the case was transferred to the SDRCC.

114. The case law reproduced in Sport Integrity Canada's book of authorities confirms that a contamination hypothesis that is not supported by objective analyses or concrete evidence is insufficient to meet the burden of proof imposed on the Athlete.

115. In *UKAD v. Buttifant*[5], the UK's doping tribunal stated that while Rule 10.2.3 allows all relevant evidence to be considered, the Athlete's explanation must be based on objective evidence.

116. In the present case, the Athlete has not submitted any case law or developed any legal arguments to challenge the clearly established principle that it is incumbent upon him to

[4] *CCES v. Findlay*, SDRCC DT 16-0242, para. 76-77.
[5] *UKAD v. Buttifant*, SR/NADP/508/2016

identify, on a balance of probabilities, the source of the prohibited substance to hope to benefit from a reduction in the sanction.

iv. Intent, no fault and mitigating factors

117. The elements invoked by the Athlete's representative, including his athletic background, compliance history, alleged lack of intent to dope, and low concentration of the detected substance, were carefully examined.

118. However, no documentary evidence was produced to support the Athlete's character and professional excellence. No testimony was offered. The three witnesses announced in the written submissions were not heard, and no formal confirmation of their appearance was received, despite the lack of opposition from Sport Integrity Canada.

119. The absence of evidence cannot be overcome by making unsubstantiated factual assertions. Submissions are not evidence.

120. The decision made in *WADA v. RADO & Alanzo Greaves*[6] confirms, as a general principle that an athlete must establish how the substance entered their body in order to rebut the applicable presumption.

121. As a result, the Tribunal cannot proceed to analyze the provisions relating to no fault or negligence, or no significant fault or negligence, set out in CADP Rules 10.4 to 10.6.

v. Alleged imbalance of anti-doping system and right to be heard

122. The Athlete made submissions with respect to the rigorous nature of the anti-doping system and the alleged imbalance of the applicable burden of proof during the proceedings.

123. I recognize that this system imposes high standards on athletes. However, this mechanism stems from the principle of strict liability and the objectives pursued by the CADP, in particular the effectiveness of the anti-doping system, consistency of decisions, protection of the integrity of sport, and fairness for all athletes. Reversing the burden in certain circumstances is precisely to ensure effective and consistent management of doping cases. I am therefore bound by the applicable legal framework, which allows only a very

[6] *WADA v. Caribbean Regional Anti-Doping Organization (RADO) & Alanzo Greaves*, CAS 2016/A/4662

narrow corridor for exceptions in the absence of the conditions strictly provided for in the CADP. In the absence of evidence, I was unable to conduct any such analysis.

124. The Athlete's arguments regarding an imbalance of power and the impossibility of satisfying the burdens were made without being supported by exhibits, case law or evidence. The Athlete argues that his right to be heard was violated both with respect to his right to a hearing on his disclosure application and his right to call witnesses.

125. The matter of disclosure was definitively resolved by Order O-02, which concluded that Sport Integrity Canada had discharged its duty to disclose.

126. The right to be heard does not necessarily imply an oral hearing on each motion, nor a reply when both Parties have had the opportunity to present their arguments; in the case of arbitration governed by the CADP, the Tribunal retains control of the proceedings when the Parties have had an opportunity to make representations.

127. In accordance with CADP Rule 8, the Doping Panel determines the procedure applicable to the proceedings and receives evidence and submissions from the parties, whether presented orally or in writing (CADP Rules 8.2.2 and 8.2.4.7).

128. After consulting the Parties and reviewing the status of the case, the Tribunal considered that it had the necessary elements to decide the issues without an oral hearing or a reply.

129. In the circumstances, the decision to proceed on the basis of the written record was within the procedural management authority of the Tribunal and met CADP fairness requirements.

130. Regarding the possibility of hearing testimony at the hearing, the record shows that both the Athlete and Sport Integrity Canada signed Procedural Order O-3, in which they committed to file, within the deadline provided, the list of their witnesses and the anticipated length and scope of their testimony.

131. The Athlete did not, however, submit his list within fourteen (14) days prior to the hearing, in accordance with the Order.

132. In addition, on January 30, 2026, the Athlete's representative confirmed by email that he would not be calling any witnesses.

133. At the hearing, Sport Integrity Canada also indicated that it did not object to the Athlete testifying, while he was present at the hearing. The Athlete chose not to testify.

134. In the present case, there is no evidence that the Athlete was prevented from providing relevant evidence or testimony.

135. The Tribunal therefore finds that no breach of the right to be heard has been established.

vi. Alleged impact of sanction on career

136. The Athlete's counsel argued that the sanction would have a significant impact on his professional career. That argument has been heard.

137. However, there was no independent evidence to support this claim. No testimony, professional statement or employer documentation was filed. Counsel's submissions are not evidence and cannot substitute for the absence of evidence.

138. The case law in Sport Integrity Canada's book of authorities confirms that such impacts, when alleged, must be established by objective evidence and cannot, on their own, justify an exemption from the sanctioning regime prescribed by the applicable rules, as confirmed by *Oleksandr Rybka v. UEFA*[7]. Such consequences, even if they were established, would not permit a departure from the CADP's regulatory framework without the strict conditions therein.

139. The Tribunal remains bound by the CADP's regulatory framework and has no discretionary power to depart from it in the absence of the strictly prescribed conditions.

140. Accordingly, the presumptive sanction of four (4) years in CADP Rule 10.2.1.1 must be applied.

[7] *Oleksandr Rybka v. UEFA*, CAS 2012/A/2759

IX. CONCLUSION

141. For all of the above reasons, I find that the Athlete has committed an ADRV as defined in CADP Rule 2.1.2, with the presence of Ostarine in his samples, having been established in accordance with the applicable rules.

142. The presumption of validity of the analyses performed by the accredited laboratory has not been rebutted. The Athlete did not demonstrate any deviations from the ISL or irregularities that would have caused the adverse analytical finding.

143. With respect to the sanction, the Athlete did not establish, on a balance of probabilities, that the violation was not intentional as defined in CADP Rule 10.2.3. He did not identify the source of the prohibited substance, and no exceptional circumstances were shown to allow a departure from the applicable presumptive system.

144. In the absence of evidence establishing how the prohibited substance entered his body, the conditions for reducing or eliminating the period of ineligibility under CADP Rules 10.2, 10.4 to 10.6 have not been met.

145. It follows that the presumptive period of ineligibility of four (4) years provided for under CADP Rule 10.2.1.1 must be applied; there is no CADP provision that enables the applicable period of ineligibility to be reduced or eliminated under the circumstances.

X. DECISION

146. The Athlete, Jonathan Sarrazin, has committed an ADRV pursuant to CADP Rule 2.1.2.

147. He is suspended for a period of four (4) years, in accordance with CADP Rule 10.2.1.1.

148. Given that the Athlete has been temporarily suspended since September 17, 2024 pursuant to CADP Rule 7.4.1, his period of ineligibility is calculated as of that date and will end on September 16, 2028, in accordance with CADP Rule 10.13.2.

149. This suspension results in the full consequences provided under the CADP.

150. In accordance with Rule 13.2.2 of the CADP, since this case concerns a national competition and the Athlete is a national-level athlete, the decision may be appealed by means of a written notice of appeal addressed to all parties before the Doping Panel and to the Appeal Tribunal within thirty (30) days of notification of this initial decision, that is, **March 25, 2026**.

151. This amended reasoned decision is issued in accordance with Article 9.1.1 of the International Standard for Results Management (ISRM).

152. This amended decision is intended solely to correct a technical omission. This correction does not affect the substance of the decision or the findings of the Panel.

Signed in Montreal on March 9, 2026.

_____

Patrice Brunet, Arbitrator