

worldsportslawreport

FEATURED ARTICLE
05/11



cecile park publishing

Head Office UK: Cecile Park Publishing Limited, 17 The Timber Yard, Drysdale Street, London N1 6ND
tel +44 (0)20 7012 1380 fax +44 (0)20 7729 6093 info@e-comlaw.com
www.e-comlaw.com

IOC 'Osaka rule': prohibition of dopers from the Olympics

The Court of Arbitration for Sport has been asked to rule on the legitimacy of the IOC's Regulations Regarding Participation in the Olympic Games - Rule 45 of the Olympic Charter, which bans athletes convicted of doping from competing at the next edition of the Olympic Games. Alexandre Miguel Mestre, a Senior Associate with PLMJ, examines whether the so-called 'Osaka Rule' constitutes a disciplinary sanction or an eligibility condition, assessing whether it constitutes a violation of the common law principle that double punishments should be prohibited.

Introduction

On 27 April, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) announced: 'The International Olympic Committee (IOC) and the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC) have agreed to ask the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) for a definitive ruling concerning the IOC's "Regulations Regarding Participation in the Olympic Games - Rule 45 of the Olympic Charter", known as the "Osaka" or "6 Month" rule¹. The position of CAS will be vital in the countdown to the London 2012 Olympic Games (OG), as its role will be to provide the necessary legal certainty and to clarify who may and who may not take part in the said event. In this context, a discussion of the 'Osaka Rule'² is therefore necessary. This short article is our modest contribution to that discussion.

The 'Osaka Rule' and similar rules in sport

According to the 'Osaka Rule', '[a]ny person who has been sanctioned with a suspension of more than six months by any anti-doping organization for any violation of any anti-doping regulations may not participate, in any capacity, in the next edition of the Games of the Olympiad and of the Olympic Winter Games following the date of expiry of such suspension'.

This rule is very similar to a rule that was considered by CAS in the Valverde³ award, according to which a licensee, in relation to which an investigation has been commenced regarding a fact that could amount to a violation of the Union Cycliste Internationale anti-doping regulations, cannot be selected for the world championships. CAS classified the said rules as a disciplinary sanction (§ 53). In another case⁴, CAS considered that there was 'at least

an inherent disciplinary aspect' in a rule in the 'UEFA Champions League Regulations', which established the following necessary requirement: '[t]o be eligible to participate in the competition', the club in question 'must not be or have been involved in any activity aimed at arranging or influencing the outcome of a match at national or international level'.

With all due respect, I disagree with the said classification. What is involved here is not a disciplinary sanction for violation of a rule of conduct but a participation requirement, an eligibility condition for participation in the OG. The key words are in fact eligibility and participation.

History of the 'Osaka Rule'

A historical interpretation of the rule takes us back to 1964 when the 'Eligibility Rules of the International Olympic Committee', were adopted one of which concerned 'Doping of athletes', and had the following text: 'The use of drugs or artificial stimulants of any kind is condemned and any person offering or accepting dope, in any form whatsoever, cannot participate in the Olympic Games'.

So far as systematic interpretation is concerned, the IOC placed Rule 45 in the part of the Olympic Charter (OC), entitled 'Participation in the Olympic Games'⁵, and not in the part regarding 'Measures and Sanctions'⁶. The first section within the said Rule is not only entitled 'Eligibility Code', but provides that '[t]o be eligible for participation in the Olympic Games', it is necessary to comply with both the OC and the World Anti-doping Code (WADC).

Finally, it appears from the text and purport of the rule that it is not intended to punish the athlete, as the punishment occurred previously when the disciplinary

sanction was imposed. What the rule involves is something quite different: i.e. the protection of the image, prestige and reputation of the OG, in terms of the ethical principles that are reflected in the OC, particularly in its Preamble. The credibility of the event depends, to a great extent, on the profile of those who take part in it and the history of the OG is such a valuable asset that it must be preserved in order not to place the future of the OG at risk.

Analysis

I do not consider that disciplinary jurisdiction and eligibility conditions should be regarded as equivalent. This can be seen from the differing nature of the legal assets intended to be protected by the rules. Essentially, the aim of any disciplinary sanction within the ambit of doping is the protection of the physical and mental health of athletes and to ensure fair competition between all participants, so that sports results are not the consequence of the administration of forbidden substances or methods which artificially improve athletes' performances. A rule that prevents participation in a sports event by those who have been punished for a disciplinary offence committed during another event, is different. In that case, the aim is to prevent the image, prestige and reputation of the event from being negatively affected by the participation of athletes who have not complied with the principles of sportsmanship and who are not identified with the principles and values inherent in the event. There are legal precedents for this. Firstly in the awards referred to above. In the Valverde award, the need to protect the integrity, serenity and reputation of the World Championships is invoked (§ 43)⁷; the decision regarding the UEFA

Our position is that the 'Osaka Rule' does not involve a further disciplinary sanction, but rather concerns questions of eligibility and participation

rule states as follows: 'the candidate has seriously violated the values and objectives of UEFA. The intent and purpose of non-admission to the CL is (...) that a club, whose violation of UEFA's values and objectives has been established, "may not take part in the most prestigious competition unpunished." (§ 37)'.

Our position is that the 'Osaka Rule' does not involve a further disciplinary sanction, but rather concerns questions of eligibility and participation, even if there is a prior disciplinary sanction on which exclusion from participation is based. This view also finds support from the following:

- Rule 20.1.6 of the WADC, which provides that 'to agree to be bound by anti-doping rules on conformity with the Code' is 'a condition of such participation'.

- Article 48 of Portugal's 'Legal Framework governing Sports Federations'⁸ which - under the heading of 'Eligibility requirements' - provides that persons who have been convicted of criminal offences, administrative misdemeanours or disciplinary offences involving doping are ineligible for election to the governing bodies of sports federations until five years after compliance with the penalty imposed.

- CAS also states⁹ 'prosecution against doping is a condition to belong and to participate in the internationally recognized Sporting system and [...] failure to abide by and enforce anti-doping rules puts an entity outside the Olympic Movement'.

Conclusion

In the light of all of the matters stated above, it appears to me that the approach adopted by the IOC in another case decided by CAS¹⁰ was correct: '(...) the right to accept or reject entries into the Olympic

Games, and (...) the decision as to whether to accept or reject an entry is a purely administrative decision'.

However, even if the 'Osaka Rule' must be classified as a disciplinary sanction, I consider that there is nevertheless no question of double punishment (being punished twice for the same offence), contrary to the principle of *ne bis in idem* (double jeopardy, to use the common law expression). This is firstly because CAS itself held in 1996¹¹ that there was no violation of *ne bis in idem* when the sanctions are not based on the same rules and are of differing ambit, even if the facts are the same.

Accordingly, for instance, there is no violation of *ne bis in idem* when the IOC bans an athlete from taking part in the OG who has already served a two-year suspension from participation in a national event imposed by a national anti-doping agency in accordance with the national anti-doping rules.

Indeed, this appears to be the logic underlying the WADC. For example, Rule 23.5 - which is entitled 'Additional Consequences' - provides that violation of the WADC can also result in 'other consequences pursuant to the Olympic Charter', i.e. instead of the WADC establishing one or more ancillary sanctions, it refers to other rules in another text - the OC - which necessarily has a different and more limited ambit (limited to the OG)¹². For all of these reasons, the question that has so concerned CAS does not arise here, i.e. the 'legitimate expectation [of the athlete] that, once he has completed the punishment imposed on him, he will be permitted to enter and participate in all competitions absent some new reason for refusing his entry'¹³.

In any event, whatever the legal

classification of the 'Osaka Rule', it is my view that the rule is proportionate, as it does not involve permanent and complete ineligibility: The athlete is not permanently banned from competing in the OG and may always compete in other events organised by public and private, national and international organisations, particularly World Championships organised under the auspices of the corresponding International Federation. Accordingly, any potential for conflict between the 'Osaka Rule', on the one hand, and competition law¹⁴ and the right to work, on the other, appears to be excluded.

Alexandre Miguel Mestre Senior Associate
A.M.Pereira, Sáragga Leal, Oliveira Martins, Júdice e Associados (PLMJ), Lisbon
alexandre.mestre@plmj.pt

Alexandre is Author of the book 'The Law of the Olympic Games' (2009).

1. www.olympic.org/media?articleid=126290, accessed on 27 April 2011.
2. Approved at the IOC Executive Board Meeting held in Athens on 27 June 2008, these Regulations apply to violations of any anti-doping regulations committed after 1 July 2008.
3. CAS 2007/0/1381 'RFEC & Alejandro Valverde c. UCI', award dated 26 September 2007.
4. CAS 2008/A/1583 'Sport Lisboa e Benfica Futebol SAD v. UEFA & FC Porto Futebol SAD' & CAS 2008/A/1584 'Vitória Sport Clube de Guimarães v. UEFA & FC Porto Futebol SAD', award dated 15 July 2008.
5. Rules 41 et seq.
6. Rules 23 et seq.
7. '(...) l'objectif est de '...protéger l'intégrité, la sérénité et la réputation des championnats du monde'.
8. Decree-Law no. 248-B/2008, of 31 December.
9. CAS 2005/C/481, CONI, 16 April 2005, § 61.

10. CAS ad hoc Division OG 02/001, 'Prusis & Latvian Olympic Committee (LOC)/IOC', award dated 5 February 2002.
11. CAS 96/156, 'Jessika Foschi v. FINA', award dated 6 October 1997, § 11.2.
12. The following is a Spanish example of the application of the ne bis in idem principle: The Spanish Sport Discipline Committee, which bases the specific features of sports disciplinary proceedings on the 'specific subordination' which exists in relation to the sports federations and therefore admits the possibility of ne bis in idem in sport, (cf., inter alia, Resolution no. 258/2001 bis).
13. See footnote 8, § 7.
14. See, inter alia, Judgment of the European Court of Justice in Case C-519/04 P, 'David Meca-Medina and Igor Majcen v. Commission of the European Communities', 18 July 2006, ECR 2006, p. I-6991.

SIGN UP FOR FREE E-LAW ALERTS

World Sports Law Report provides a free alert service. We send out updates on breaking news, forthcoming events and each month on the day of publication we send out the headlines and a precis of all of the articles in the issue.

To receive these free e-law alerts, register on www.e-comlaw.com/updates.asp or email ngaio.claris@e-comlaw.com



cecile park publishing

Head Office UK Cecile Park Publishing Limited, 17 The Timber Yard, Drysdale Street, London N1 6ND
tel +44 (0)20 7012 1380 fax +44 (0)20 7729 6093 info@e-comlaw.com
www.e-comlaw.com

Registered number 2676976 Registered address 141 Wardour Street, London W1F 0UT VAT registration 577806103

e-commerce law & policy

Many leading companies, including Amazon, BT, eBay, FSA, Orange, Vodafone, Standard Life, and Microsoft have subscribed to ECLP to aid them in solving the business and legal issues they face online.

ECLP was nominated in 2000 and again in 2004 for the British & Irish Association of Law Librarians' Legal Publication of the Year.

A twelve month subscription is £440 (overseas £460) for twelve issues and includes single user access to our online database.

e-commerce law reports

You can now find in one place all the key cases, with analysis and comment, that affect online, mobile and interactive business. ECLR tracks cases and regulatory adjudications from around the world.

Leading organisations, including Clifford Chance, Herbert Smith, Baker & McKenzie, Hammonds, Coudert Brothers, Orange and Royal Mail are subscribers.

A twelve month subscription is £440 (overseas £460) for six issues and includes single user access to our online database.

data protection law & policy

You can now find in one place the most practical analysis, and advice, on how to address the many problems - and some opportunities - thrown up by data protection and freedom of information legislation.

DPLP's monthly reports update an online archive, which is an invaluable research tool for all those who are involved in data protection. Data acquisition, SMS marketing, subject access, Freedom of Information, data retention, use of CCTV, data sharing and data transfer abroad are all subjects that have featured recently.

Leading organisations, including the Office of the Information Commissioner, Allen & Overy, Hammonds, Lovells, BT, Orange, West Berkshire Council, McCann Fitzgerald, Devon County Council and Experian are subscribers.

A twelve month subscription is £410 (public sector £290, overseas £430) for twelve issues and includes single user access to our online database.

world online gambling law report

You can now find in one place analysis of the key legal, financial and regulatory issues facing all those involved in online gambling and practical advice on how to address them. The monthly reports update an online archive, which is an invaluable research tool for all those involved in online gambling.

Poker, payment systems, white labelling, jurisdiction, betting exchanges, regulation, testing, interactive TV and mobile gaming are all subjects that have featured in WOGLR recently.

Leading organisations, including Ladbrokes, William Hill, Coral, Sportingbet, BskyB, DCMS, PMU, Orange and Clifford Chance are subscribers.

A twelve month subscription is £545 (overseas £565) for twelve issues and includes single user access to our online database.

world sports law report

WSLR tracks the latest developments from insolvency rules in football, to EU Competition policy on the sale of media rights, to doping and probity. The monthly reports update an online archive, which is an invaluable research tool for all involved in sport.

Database rights, sponsorship, guerilla marketing, the Court of Arbitration in Sport, sports agents, image rights, jurisdiction, domain names, ticketing and privacy are subjects that have featured in WSLR recently.

Leading organisations, including the England & Wales Cricket Board, the British Horse Board, Hammonds, Fladgate Fielder, Clarke Willmott and Skadden Arps Meagre & Flom are subscribers.

A twelve month subscription is £545 (overseas £565) for twelve issues and includes single user access to our online database.

priority order form

FAX +44 (0)20 7729 6093

CALL +44 (0)20 7012 1380

EMAIL ngaio.claris@e-comlaw.com

ONLINE www.e-comlaw.com

POST Cecile Park Publishing 17 The Timber Yard, Drysdale Street, London N1 6ND

- ☐ Please enrol me as a subscriber to **e-commerce law & policy** at £440 (overseas £460)
☐ Please enrol me as a subscriber to **e-commerce law reports** at £440 (overseas £460)
☐ Please enrol me as a subscriber to **data protection law & policy** at £410 (public sector £290, overseas £430)
☐ Please enrol me as a subscriber to **world online gambling law report** at £545 (overseas £565)
☐ Please enrol me as a subscriber to **world sports law report** at £545 (overseas £565)

All subscriptions last for one year. You will be contacted at the end of that period to renew your subscription.

Name			
Job Title			
Department		Company	
Address			
Address			
City		State	
Country		Postcode	
Telephone		Fax	
Email			

1 Please **invoice me** Purchase order number
Signature Date

2 I enclose a **cheque** for the amount of
made payable to 'Cecile Park Publishing Limited'

3 Please debit my **credit card** VISA ☐ MASTERCARD ☐
Card No. Expiry Date
Signature Date
VAT No. (if ordering from an EC country)

Periodically we may allow companies, whose products or services might be of interest, to send you information.
Please tick here if you would like to hear from other companies about products or services that may add value to your subscription. ☐