

In the matter of the Canadian Anti-Doping Program;

**And in the matter of an anti-doping rule violation by Mohamad Arnaout asserted
by the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport;**

File Outcome Summary

Summary

1. The Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (CCES) conducted an out-of-competition sample collection session in Mississauga, Ontario.
2. Mr. Mohamad Arnaout (“the athlete”) was selected for doping control. The sample provided by the athlete returned an adverse finding for SARM S-22 (S1. Anabolic Agent) and GW501516 (S4. Hormone and Metabolic Modulators), both prohibited substances.
3. The athlete admitted the asserted violation in a timely manner, and requested a hearing to determine sanction length outlined within the Canadian Anti-Doping Program (CADP). However, after requesting a hearing the athlete did not participate in the results management process within the timelines identified in the CADP and as a result was deemed to have waived his right to a hearing and accepted the proposed consequences of the admitted anti-doping rule violation.

Jurisdiction

4. The CCES is an independent not-for-profit organization incorporated under the federal laws of Canada that promotes ethical conduct in all aspects of sport in Canada. The CCES also maintains and carries out the CADP, including providing anti-doping services to national sport organizations and their members.
5. As Canada’s national anti-doping organization, the CCES is in compliance with the World Anti-Doping Code (Code) and its mandatory International Standards. The CCES has implemented the Code and its mandatory International Standards through the CADP, the domestic rules which govern this proceeding. The purpose of the Code and of the CADP is to protect the rights of athletes to fair competition.
6. The athlete is a member of and participates in the sport of Powerlifting with the CPU. According to Part C, Rule 1.3 of the CADP, the CADP provisions apply to all members of, and participants in the activities of, sport organizations adopting it. The CPU adopted the CADP on July 25, 2016. Therefore, as a member of CPU and/or as a participant in CPU sport activities, the athlete is subject to the Rules of the CADP.

Doping Control

7. On February 17, 2017 the CCES conducted an out-of-competition doping control session in Mississauga, Ontario. Testing at this doping control session was conducted pursuant to the CADP.
8. The athlete was notified for doping control and, together with the Doping Control Officer (DCO) from the CCES, completed the sample collection process. The athlete's sample code number was 4039896.
9. On February 22, 2017 the athlete's sample was received by World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) accredited laboratory, the INRS-Institut Armand-Frappier (INRS), in Laval, QC.

Results Management

10. The adverse analytical finding was received from the WADA accredited laboratory on April 9, 2017. The Certificate of Analysis indicated the presence of SARM S-22 and GW501516.
11. On April 19, 2017, the CCES formally asserted a violation against the athlete for the presence of two prohibited substances. As a result of the CCES' assertion the athlete was also subject to a mandatory provisional suspension.
12. In accordance with CADP Rule 10.2.1, the standard sanction for an intentional doping violation involving the presence of a prohibited substance (non-specified substance), regardless of the number of substances detected, is a four (4) year period of ineligibility. The CCES proposed the standard four (4) year sanction within its assertion of April 19, 2017.
13. On May 9, 2017 in response to the CCES assertion of a violation the athlete admitted the anti-doping rule violation in a timely fashion and requested a hearing to determine the sanction length.
14. Following the request for a hearing, the athlete did not participate any further in the results management process within the required timelines identified in the CADP.

Confirmation of Violation and Sanction

15. Rule 7.10.2 of the CADP states:

7.10.2 Alternatively, if the Athlete or other Person against whom an anti-doping rule violation is asserted fails to dispute that assertion within the deadline specified in the notice sent by the CCES asserting the violation, then he/she

shall be deemed to have admitted the violation, to have waived a hearing, and to have accepted the Consequences that are mandated by the Rules or (where some discretion as to Consequences exists under the Rules) that have been offered by CCES.

16. In accordance with CADP Rule 7.10.2, which was specifically referenced within the assertion letter, the CCES informed the athlete on June 15, 2017 that, should the athlete take no further action to participate in the results management process within 30 days of his last participation in the results management process (by July 17, 2017), he would be deemed to have waived his right to a hearing in accordance with CADP Rule 7.10.2 and thereby would have accepted the four (4) year sanction proposed by the CCES.
17. As the athlete took no further action by the July 17, 2017 deadline, the CCES relies on the provisions contained in CADP Rule 7.10.2. Accordingly, effective July 18, 2017 by reason of the deemed Waiver, a four (4) year period of ineligibility (in accordance with CADP Rule 10.2.1) has been confirmed against Mr. Arnaout for his admitted anti-doping rule violation. As a result of a timely admission (in accordance with CADP Rule 10.11.2) the athlete's sanction commenced on February 17, 2017 and concludes on February 17, 2021.
18. The CCES now considers this case closed.

Dated at Ottawa, Ontario this 20th day of July, 2017.



Jeremy Luke
Senior Director, Sport Integrity, CCES