

Final Decision of the Disciplinary Commission

Case No. 2025-05

31 August 2025

In the matter of

International Skating Union, Chemin de Brillancourt 4, 1006 Lausanne,
represented by its Legal Advisor, Prof. Dr. Michael Geistlinger

- Complainant -

against

Mr Yerkebulan Shamukhanov,

- Alleged Offender -

and

KAZAKHSTAN SKATING UNION (KZSU)

- Interested ISU Member -

Regarding Violation of the ISU Anti-Doping Rules

I. History of the Procedure

1. On 4 June 2025 the International Skating Union (ISU) represented by its Legal Advisor, Prof. Dr. Michael Geistlinger (hereinafter referred to as **"Complainant"**) filed a complaint against the Alleged Offender together with 27 exhibits.
2. On 13 June 2025, following appointment of DC Panel Members (hereinafter referred to as **"DC Panel"**), the Statement of Complaint, Exhibits and Statements of Independence from the three Disciplinary Commission Panel Members were sent to the Alleged Offender and to the Interested ISU Member by email. These documents were also sent to the Alleged Offender by DHL courier.
3. The Alleged Offender and Interested Party were invited, by the ISU Disciplinary Commission, in Order No 1, to file a Statement of Reply within 21 days upon receipt of the complaint.
4. On 3 July 2025 (within the 21-day period), the DC Panel received from the Alleged Offender by e-mail the explanatory letter (which can be considered as Statement of Response).
5. There was no response, reaction or any Statement of Reply from the Kazakhstan Skating Union as Interested Member.
6. The Statement of Reply from the Alleged Offender was forwarded to the Complainant.

II. Procedural Matters

7. In the "Declaration for Competitors and Officials entering ISU Events" signed on 16 September 2024, the Alleged Offender confirms:

I/we, the undersigned,

I) accept and undertake to fully comply with the ISU Constitution and all ISU Statutes as defined in Art. 39 of the ISU Constitution, in particular the ISU Code of Ethics (ISU Communication 2450 and any update), the ISU Anti-Doping Rules and Anti-Doping Procedures and all related and otherwise applicable anti-doping rules replicating or derived from the WADA Code including the List of Prohibited Substances and Methods and all other International Standards and Technical Documents issued by WADA,

and

II) accept the jurisdiction of the ISU Disciplinary Commission, accept the authority of any other competent National Anti-Doping Organization disciplinary authority, accept the exclusive jurisdiction of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) in Lausanne, Switzerland as the arbitration tribunal authorized to issue final and binding awards in all matters under the ISU Statutes, in particular the ISU Anti-Doping Rules, and/ or under other applicable national anti-doping rules.

8. According to Article 25.10 of the ISU Constitution and Article 8.1.1.1 of the ISU Anti-Doping Rules ("**ISU ADR**") the ISU Disciplinary Commission has jurisdiction in doping cases arising out of ISU Testing or of Testing at International Events. The present case arises out of testing of the Alleged Offender at an in-competition test under the Testing Authority of the ISU during the World Cup Short Track Speed Skating Competition in Montréal on 27 January 2025, where the Alleged Offender was subjected to testing an in-competition Anti-Doping test.
9. Therefore, the ISU Disciplinary Commission has jurisdiction to hear and decide this case.

10. According to Article 4, Para 1 of the ISU Disciplinary Commission Rules of Procedure (**Communication No. 2551**) the DC shall rule on the Complaint brought before it pursuant to the applicable provisions of the ISU Statutes, in particular the ISU Constitution, the General Regulations, the Special Regulations, other special rules, including the ISU Code of Ethics, the ISU Anti-Doping Rules, the ISU Anti-Doping Procedures, the Technical Rules, the DC Rules of Procedure, and other decisions of the ISU Council made in accordance with Article 17 of the Constitution communicated and published in accordance with the provisions of Article 28 of the Constitution and general principles of law.
11. According to Article 3, Para 2 of the DC Rules of Procedure, the proceedings are based upon the written submissions of the Parties. The Panel, at its sole discretion, may decide to hold a hearing.

III. Facts

12. Alleged Offender is an international level skater and member of the Kazakhstan Skating Union (**KZSU**).
13. On 27 October 2024, under the authority of the ISU, a Doping Control Officer (**DCO**) collected a urine Sample from the Alleged Offender in an in-competition test during the World Cup Short Track Speed Skating in Montréal, with reference numbers A 8074158 (**the "A-Sample"**) and B 8074158 (**the "B-Sample"**).
14. The Sample was shipped to the INRS Centre Armand Frappier Santé Biotechnologie, the Montréal World Anti-Doping Agency (**"WADA"**) accredited Laboratory (**the "Laboratory"**) in Laval Québec, Canada for analysis. The Laboratory analysed the A-Sample and reported an AAF for the prohibited substance Trimetazidine, which is a non-Specified Substance falling under S4. Hormone and Metabolic Modulators/trimetazidine of the WADA List of Prohibited

Substances 2024. The Laboratory reported that neither lomerizine nor its metabolite N-dealkylated lomerizine (M6) were detected in the Sample. The concentration was reported at 0.04 ng/ml.

15. An initial review of the AAF was conducted which revealed that the Alleged Offender had no applicable Therapeutic Use Exemption ("**TUE**") to justify the Presence of Trimetazidine in his system and that there was no apparent departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations or from the International Standard for Laboratories that caused the AAF. In addition, it was not apparent that the AAF was caused by an ingestion of Trimetazidine through an authorized route.
16. On 2 December 2024, as a consequence of the results of the initial review, the ISU notified the Alleged Offender of an AAF for Trimetazidine, which may result in the anti-doping rule violations for:
- *Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in a Skater's Sample, pursuant to Article 2.1 ISU ADR, and/or;*
 - *Use of a Prohibited Substance pursuant to Article 2.2 ISU ADR.*
17. In the same letter the ISU notified the Alleged Offender that, from the date of this notification, he was provisionally suspended from participation in any Competition or other activity subject to the authority of the ISU prior to the final decision being reached at a hearing in this matter.
18. Further to the above the ISU, by letter of 2 December 2024, informed the Alleged Offender of his right to request copies of the A-Sample Laboratory Documentation Package. He was notified that he could submit a written explanation to the ISU Director General about the overall circumstances of the case or dispute the ISU allegation that an anti-doping rule violation ("ADRV") had occurred within 15 days and within 4 days request that the B-Sample be opened and analysed.
19. In addition, the Alleged Offender was notified that he had the opportunity to provide

Substantial Assistance as set out in Article 10.7 of the ISU ADR, with the possible consequence of a partial suspension of the period of ineligibility and/or to admit the ADRV and/or then to seek to enter into a case resolution agreement under Article 10.8.2 of the ISU ADR.

20. By email of 2 December 2024, the Secretary General of the KZSU confirmed receipt of the notification and that it had informed the Alleged Offender of the contents of the notification.

21. After obtaining information about the cost of opening the B-Sample and provision of the Documentation Packages for the A-Sample and B-Sample, the Alleged Offender requested the opening of the B-Sample by email of 11 December 2024.

22. In his Explanations, the Alleged Offender declared that he had never knowingly or intentionally used drugs. He also wanted to note that his country has zero tolerance for doping and that they pass doping controls twice a year.

23. All of his previous tests were negative. The last time he underwent a doping control was on October 5, 2024, at the Kazakhstan NADO. That result was negative. He cannot understand how Trimetazidine could have entered his body. He has always diligently checked the contents of all dietary supplements taken and was sure that they were safe. The only way he could imagine this occurring was contamination by one of the biologically active additives. The Alleged Offender was ready to do everything possible to clarify this issue.

24. The opening of the B-Sample took place at the Montréal Laboratory, in the presence of an independent observer, on 17 December 2024. The Alleged Offender and KZSU accepted this, but could not be present in person. The ISU did not send a representative either.

25. The analysis of the B-Sample confirmed the results of the A-Sample analysis.

26. By emails of 20 December 2024, the ISU informed the Alleged Offender of the results of the B-Sample analysis, set a deadline of 30 December 2024 for supplementing his explanations, reminded the Alleged Offender of the option of admitting the ADRV and informed him of the costs of analysis of substances by the Lausanne laboratory.
27. On 21 December 2024, the Alleged Offender submitted his supplementary explanations. He listed all the supplements and medications he had used prior to the doping test. These included, according to his list, "Citruline" (manufacturer: Beyond); "Product 2"; "Product 3"; "Product 4" and "Product 5". (The names of the latter products have been redacted as they were not subsequently tested).
28. The Alleged Offender stated that his budget did not allow him to test all these substances. He considered that Citruline and "Product 2" might be the substances most likely to be contaminated and hence that he wanted to have these two substances tested by the Lausanne laboratory.
29. He added a report on how he used the substances on 27 October 2024 and pictures of him holding the respective packages. In addition, the Alleged Offender raised questions as to Article 10.8.1 and 10.8.2 ISU Anti-Doping Rules (**ADR**).
30. On 18 January 2025, the ISU sent a Notice of Charge to the Alleged Offender and provided him with two proposals for admission of the ADRV and acceptance of the consequences. One was for the case of contamination and one for the case of non-contamination. The ISU declared as follows:

"The ISU is ready to facilitate the analysis of the products Citrulline and ("Product 2"), as provided by Mr. Shamukhanov, by the Lausanne laboratory upon his explicit confirmation at the earliest convenience. Should the analysis confirm Mr. Shamukhanov's assumption that one of these products was the

origin of the presence of Trimetazidine in his body, Article 10.6.1.2 ISU ADR may allow the negotiation of a case resolution agreement with the ISU and WADA under Article 10.8.2. That means that if Mr. Shamukhanov can establish No Significant Fault or Negligence for having taken the Contaminated Product, then the period of Ineligibility shall be, at a minimum, a reprimand and no period of Ineligibility, and at a maximum two-year Ineligibility, depending on Mr. Shamukhanov's degree of Fault. If a period of Ineligibility will be imposed, half of that period must be served. By signing the Admission form (Contaminated Product), Mr. Shamukhanov accepts the Consequences as decided by the ISU and WADA at their sole discretion. Should the analysis of the two products not show contamination, Article 10.8.2 ISU ADR cannot be applied, a procedure before the ISU Disciplinary Commission will follow and the ISU will ask the Disciplinary Commission to impose a period of four years Ineligibility."

31. The ISU set a deadline of 20 days from receipt of the Notice of Charge for the Alleged Offender to accept the above.
32. On 18 January 2025, the Alleged Offender returned the Admission Form for the case of contamination, signed on 17 January 2025, and declared that he hereby confirmed his agreement to proceed under the provisions of Article 10.8.2, acknowledging the possibility of a reduced sanction based on the contamination of the products which he consumed.
33. The Alleged Offender stated that he was fully prepared to co-operate in this matter and would provide the relevant supplements for analysis. He asked for instructions on the procedure for submitting the products indicated, as most likely the source of contamination, to a WADA-accredited laboratory for testing. He emphasized that these products were consumed in good faith, with no intention to gain any unfair advantage.
34. By having signed the Admission Form for the case of contamination, the Alleged

Offender accepted a *"sanction according to Article 10.6.1.2 of the ISU ADR, ranging from a Reprimand to a Period of two (2) years ineligibility to be reduced upon discretion of WADA and the ISU through a Case Resolution Agreement, given the conditions of Articles 10.6.1.2 and 10.8.2 of the ISU ADR are met"*, and expressly waived his right to have those Consequences determined by the ISU Disciplinary Commission.

35. Upon request of the ISU, the Montréal Laboratory provided the ISU with the Documentation Package for the urine A-Sample and B-Sample No. 8074158 on 21 January 2025.
36. By email of 25 January 2025, the ISU informed the Alleged Offender of the process regarding the analysis of the dietary supplements suspected of contamination that he wished to have analysed and a questionnaire in that context. The questionnaire was completed by the Alleged Offender on 1 February 2025.
37. By email of 11 February 2025, the ISU confirmed to the Alleged Offender, that the products to be analysed were received by the Lausanne laboratory. The ISU also confirmed that it had communicated to the laboratory that the Alleged Offender no longer wanted to have "Product 2" analysed.
38. On 14 March 2025, the Lausanne laboratory issued its Pre-Assessment Report and concluded that the analyses were not in conflict with the Laboratory Code of Ethics.
39. The ISU forwarded this report to the Alleged Offender on 17 March 2025. The Alleged Offender responded by email on 18 March 2025, that he wanted to have the Citrulline supplement tested first.
40. On 28 March 2025, the Lausanne laboratory issued its Report on the Results of the Analysis of Citrulline Malate from Beyond Sports Nutrition. The laboratory

concluded that "Analyses performed in both food suppléments did not indicate présence of Trimetazidine in the three aliquots randomly sampled at three different positions of each sachet; one in the upper part, one in the middle and one in the lower part of the powder. The results support the proposition that the supplement Citrulline Malate is not contaminated with Trimetazidine rather being contaminated. The support is qualified as extremely strong (> 10'000 times more probable)."

41. The report was forwarded to the Alleged Offender on 1 April 2025.

42. On 3 April 2025, the Alleged Offender acknowledged receipt of the report and added a letter of disappointment and acknowledgment.

43. Since the Alleged Offender did not request any further analysis by the set deadline (one week from receipt of the above report), the ISU had to continue results management by submitting this Statement of Complaint.

44. In his defence, the Alleged Offender, in a letter addressed to the DC Panel as Statement of Response dated 3 July 2025, stated:

"I have never knowingly used any prohibited substances. I respect the principles of fair sport and have always tried to be an example of professionalism, discipline, and ethics throughout my career.

It is deeply painful for me to realize that, despite all my efforts, I was unable to prove my innocence. Perhaps my lack of legal resources and experience has played a role in this outcome. Today, I find myself in a position where all I can do is wait for your final decision, and this is emotionally difficult."

IV. Law

45. According to Article 2.1. of the ISU ADR, the presence of a Prohibited Substance in a Skater's bodily specimen constitutes an ADRV, unless a Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) for the otherwise Prohibited Substance has been granted in accordance with Article D of the ISU Anti-Doping Procedures. There was no Therapeutic Use Exemption given in the case at hand. There was also no apparent departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations nor from the International Standard for Laboratories that caused the AAF.

46. According to Article 2.1.1. of the ISU ADR, Skaters are responsible for knowing what constitutes an anti-doping rule violation and the substances and methods which have been included in the Prohibited List. Under Article 2.1.1 it is each Skater's personal duty to ensure that no Prohibited Substance enters his body. Skaters are responsible for any Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers found to be present in their Samples. It is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing use on the Skater's part be demonstrated in order to establish an ADRV under Article 2.1.

47. It is undisputed that the Alleged Offender committed an anti-doping rule violation, within the meaning of Article 2.1 of the ISU Anti-Doping Rules.

48. Article 10.2 of the ISU Anti-Doping Rules 2020 sets out the period of ineligibility that must be imposed on the Alleged Offender.

49. As stated before, Trimetazidine, is a non-Specified Substance falling under S4. Hormone and Metabolic Modulators/trimetazidine of the WADA List of Prohibited Substances 2024 and, thus, is a Specified Substance under the meaning of Article 10.2 of the ISU Anti-Doping Rules.

50. According to Article 10.2.1. read together with Article 10.2.1.1 of the ISU Anti-Doping Rules, the period of Ineligibility shall be four years. Any reduction of the

Ineligibility period must then follow the criteria set out under Article 10.4 or Article 10.5 of the ISU Anti-Doping Rules.

51. The Alleged Offender was convinced that the prohibited substance must have entered his body by contamination of a product, but financially could only afford to have one of the possible products tested. That product tested negative for Trimetazidine, with no evidence of contamination, so the test was unsuccessful for the Alleged Offender.

52. Hence, no evidence has been submitted by the Alleged Offender of the alleged contamination, nor any evidence demonstrating No Fault or Negligence or No Significant Fault or Negligence.

V. Costs

53. According to Article 12.4 of the ISU Anti-Doping Rules 2020, the ISU Member shall be obligated to reimburse the ISU for all costs (including but not limited to laboratory fees, hearing and travel expenses) related to a violation of these Anti-Doping Rules committed by a skater affiliated with that member.

54. Therefore, the costs of these proceedings, including the laboratory fees of the Anti-Doping testing, must be borne by the Interested ISU Member - the Kazakhstan Skating Union.

55. The Alleged Offender must bear his own costs.

56. Based on the above considerations the Panel rules as follows:

VI. Decision


1. Mr. Yerkebulan Shamukhanov is declared responsible for an Anti-Doping violation, committed on October 27, 2024 at the World Cup Short Track Speed Skating in Montréal, Canada.
2. A period of ineligibility of four (4) years, beginning on October 27, 2024 and ending on October 26, 2028 midnight, is imposed on Yerkebulan Shamukhanov.
3. The Kazakhstan Skating Union must reimburse the ISU for the costs of these proceedings and the laboratory fees for the Anti-Doping testing.
4. The skater Yerkebulan Shamukhanov bears his own costs.



Sue Petricevic (Chair)



Dr. Allan Böhm



Eugen Larasser

The present decision is subject to appeal to the Court of Arbitration for Sport, Avenue de Beaumont 2, CH-1012 Lausanne, Switzerland, within 21 days upon receipt of the decision, in accordance with Article 25 Paragraph 12 and Article 26 of the ISU Constitution