Decision of the Dispute Resolution Chamber

passed in Zurich, Switzerland, on 4 October 2013,

in the following composition:

Geoff Thompson (England), Chairman
Takuya Yamazaki (Japan), member
Theodore Giannikos (Greece), member

on the claim presented by the player,

Player S, from country G

as *Claimant*

against the club,

Club K, from country T

as *Respondent*

regarding an employment-related dispute between the parties

I. Facts of the case

1. After having signed a "pre-agreement" on 1 July 2010, Player S from country G (hereinafter: *player* or *Claimant*), and the Club K, from country T (hereinafter: *club* or *Respondent*) signed an "agreement", on 13 July 2010, covering the 2010-11 and 2011-12 seasons (hereinafter: *agreement*).

2. In accordance with the agreement, the player was entitled to receive the following remuneration:

    - 2010-11 season:
        - EUR 100,000 on 24 August 2010;
        - EUR 100,000 payable in 10 monthly instalments of EUR 10,000 as from August;
        - EUR 100,000 divided over 34 matches - EUR 2,941 per match. If the player would sit on the bench he would receive 75% of this amount.
    - 2011-12 season:
        - EUR 135,000 before the end of July 2011;
        - EUR 135,000 in 10 monthly instalments of EUR 13,500 as from August;
        - EUR 130,000 divided over 34 matches - EUR 3,823 per match. If the player would sit on the bench he would receive 75% of this amount.

3. In addition, the agreement stipulates that a management fee of EUR 40,000 would be payable to the "manager" on the date of signature and before the "end of July".

4. On 22 September 2011, the player lodged a claim against the club in front of FIFA maintaining that he terminated the employment contract with just cause and that, therefore, the club is to be held liable to pay compensation in the amount of EUR 638,500 plus 5% interest as of 23 August 2011.

5. The player further asks to be awarded payment of the amount of EUR 3,077 relating to the partially outstanding salary for February 2011 and of the amount of EUR 2,300 in connection with alleged travel and accommodation costs.

6. In addition, the player asks that the club bears the procedural costs.

7. On 24 April 2012, the player extended his claim and asked that the club be instructed to pay to him the EUR 40,000 "management fee" which, according to the player, was payable until the end of July 2011. In this respect, the player presented a written declaration dated 23 April 2012, in which Mr K authorises the player to include in his labour claim the amount relating to his alleged commission on the basis of the employment contract between the Claimant and the Respondent and in which Mr K cedes his alleged right to receive the commission to the player.

8. The player explains that as from February 2011 until June 2011 he was registered with a country U club on a loan basis and that, at his return to the country T club after the loan, he was told by the club that his services were no longer required and that he should look for another employer. He adds that his agent was informed by the club that if the player would not find another club, he would still receive his contractual receivables, but not be registered with it any longer.

9. The player points out that his agent was further informed that should the player not have found other employment until 13 July 2011, he should join the team's training camp in country A, which he subsequently did. Upon his arrival together with his agent, he was refused access to it.

10. On 20 July 2011, the player put the club in default asking it to admit him to the team's training and to pay his February 2011 salary in the amount of EUR 10,000. He further specifically offered his services to the club. This letter having remained unanswered, on 2 August 2011, the player sent another default notice to the club adding the payment of the EUR 135,000 instalment that fell due by the end of July for the 2011-12 season.

11. The second default notice having remained without answer, on 11 August 2011, the player terminated the employment contract. After an exchange of correspondence between the player and the club following the player's termination notice, on 8 September 2011, the player informed the club that his termination notice of 11 August 2011 became and remains final and binding.

12. According to the player, the club's refusal to admit him to the team training and to have him officially registered with the club as well as the non-payment of his receivables in the amount of EUR 145,000 constitute a just cause for the player to terminate the employment contract.

13. As regards the amount of compensation sought, the player explains that in accordance with the agreement he was entitled to receive EUR 400,000 for the 2011-12 season, whereas he expected to return to country G in 2012 and that therefore he would be subjected to country G taxation. Consequently, the player

submitted that the amount of EUR 638,500 should be paid to him in order to be equivalent to the aforementioned net amount of EUR 400,000.

14. In addition, the player held that the breach occurred during the protected period and that he was unable to find another employer until later in 2011. Furthermore, according to the player, CAS jurisprudence shows that the specifity of sport would justify an increase of the amount of compensation with up to six months' salary.

15. As regards his salary for February 2011 he explained that the club finally failed to remit the amount of EUR 3,077, which the club attempted to justify with a fine that was allegedly imposed upon him, the validity of which he contested.

16. Furthermore, the player asked that he be reimbursed the amount of EUR 2,300 that he allegedly paid to a country N physician on behalf of the club.

17. In reply to the player's claim, the club confirms that the player was contractually bound to it as from 1 July 2010 until the end of the 2011-12 season and that he was transferred on a loan basis to the aforementioned country U club as of January 2011.

18. The club further acknowledges that for the 2011-12 season the player was to receive EUR 400,000, but deems that the employment contract did not give him the exclusive right to train with the first team and to receive the amount of EUR 135,000 in July 2011.

19. The club further holds that the employment contract does not include any tax indemnification on behalf of the player.

20. The club also points out that the country T registration period closed on 5 September 2011, as a result of which the club was not required to proceed with the ITC request before September 2011.

21. The club considers that the player asked to be remunerated before the maturity date and that he failed to join the team in country T without justification when he was asked to do so.

22. Furthermore, the club points out that, whereas the coach did not include the player in the list of players to attend the pre-season training camp in country A, the player showed up at the hotel in country A.

23. The club also highlights that no player has ever been granted a right to attend a pre-season camp to which he was not invited and no employment contract grants such right.

24. In the light of the fact that the player had left the country U club in May 2011 for medical treatment and did not return to that club afterwards, as a result of which the player had not trained during a considerable amount of time, the club deems that the player was not ready to join the club's team at the training camp before passing further medical examination. The club adds that it duly informed the player of this and that it asked the player to return to country T in order to undergo medical examination and resume training.

25. According to the club, instead of returning to country T, the player sent notifications to the club and the club paid EUR 6,923 to the player in good faith.

26. The club believes that the player had difficulty adapting himself to the city and the team as from the commencement of the employment relation, which is why he wanted to join another club after half of the first season. Furthermore, the club holds that the player unilaterally terminated his employment relation with the club before the beginning of the 2011-12 season, as he had no intention to be bound to his contractual obligations.

27. The club rejects the player's allegation that it was not willing to make use of the player's services, although it had asked the player to return to Club K and start training, based on his wrong assumption that the club had already hired three goal keepers.

28. In this respect, it submitted a copy of its correspondence dated 18 (allegedly) and 26 August 2011 in reply to the player's notice of termination, in which it explains to the player that the country U club did not want to have the International Transfer Certificate (ITC) issued as the player allegedly had to refund money to it and that he was not invited to the pre-season training camp as he was not yet officially registered with the club. The club further invited the player to resume duty and training with the club.

29. For these reasons, the club rejects the player's claim and considers that the player terminated the employment contract without valid reason.

30. In his replica, the player rejects the club's position and denies that he was transferred on a loan basis at his own wish, pointing out that it was rather on the basis of the foreign player quota in country T. He further stresses that his entitlement to train with the first team derives from the fact that he is a professional player. As regards his entitlement to the payment of EUR 135,000 in July 2011, the player holds that the agreement presented by the club is vague with respect to the due date for payment and that the consequences of such vague wording shall be borne by the party that drafted the agreement. With

respect to the ITC, he points out that the club's argument is not valid since the player was not internationally transferred as a new player but rather as a player returning to his employing club after the end of his loan.

31. In addition, the player points out that the country U club never raised any claim against him and allowed him to go to country G for medical treatment of his injury, after which he could not travel.

32. Furthermore, the player stresses that the club asked him to return to the club after almost three months since the employment contract between them had re-entered into force at the end of the loan and after the player had given the club various opportunities to remedy the breach of contract consisting of not allowing him to train with the first team and the non-payment of his remuneration.

33. The player further extended his claim to receive the EUR 40,000 "management fee" that according to the player was payable until the end of July 2011.

34. In its duplica, the club rejects the additional claim of EUR 40,000 relating to the "management fee" given that the contract dated 1 July 2010 does not indicate the involvement of a players' agent and such claim goes against the FIFA regulations and has no legal basis.

35. Furthermore, the club rejects the allegations of the player and mainly maintained its position. It highlights that the player was not admitted to the training camp, not because it was not interested in his services, but since he had to undergo medical tests due to his alleged long term injury and absence from professional football. It further stresses that it asked the player to return to the club, which he declined in the light of his allegation that the amounts of EUR 10,000 and EUR 135,000 were still outstanding.

36. The club adds that it had paid EUR 6,923 to the player, after the deduction of a fine of EUR 3,077 and that the contract does not stipulate any date of payment for the amount of EUR 135,000. The club considers that the player showed a hasty attitude by requesting payment of this amount while he did not resume his duties with the club. Had he returned to the club, it would have paid the amount of EUR 135,000 to the player for the 2011-12 season.

37. All in all, the club asks that the player be held liable for the early termination of the employment contract without just cause and to pay legal expenses as well as procedural costs. Should this request be rejected, the club asks that the remuneration earned by the player under his new employment contracts be deducted from the remuneration relating to the remaining term of the relevant

employment contract and that the player shall pay its legal expenses as well as the procedural costs.

38. On 1 September 2011, the player signed an employment contract with Club P, from country S, as an "amateur", valid until 15 December 2011 in accordance with which he was to receive a monthly allowance of currency of country S 50,000. On 1 January 2012, the player signed an employment contract with the Club L, from country N, valid until 31 December 2012, in accordance with which the player was to receive a monthly salary of currency of country N 59,000, a signing-on fee of currency of country N 450,000 payable in 2 equal instalments of currency of country N 225,000 on 20 March 2012 and 20 August 2012, respectively, as well as an apartment up to the amount of currency of country N 8,000.

II. Considerations of the Dispute Resolution Chamber

1. First of all, the Dispute Resolution Chamber (hereinafter also referred to as *Chamber* or *DRC*) analysed whether it was competent to deal with the case at hand. In this respect, it took note that the present matter was submitted to FIFA on 22 September 2011. Consequently, the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Players' Status Committee and the Dispute Resolution Chamber (edition 2008; hereinafter: *Procedural Rules*) are applicable to the matter at hand (cf. art. 21 par. 2 and par. 3 of the Procedural Rules).

2. Subsequently, the members of the Chamber referred to art. 3 par. 1 of the Procedural Rules and confirmed that in accordance with art. 24 par. 1 and par. 2 in combination with art. 22 lit. b) of the Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players (edition 2012) the Dispute Resolution Chamber is competent to deal with the matter at stake, which concerns an employment-related dispute with an international dimension between a country G player and a country T club.

3. Furthermore, the Chamber analysed which regulations should be applicable as to the substance of the matter. In this respect, it confirmed that in accordance with art. 26 par. 1 and par. 2 of the Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players (editions 2012 and 2010), and considering that the present claim was lodged on 22 September 2011, the 2010 edition of said regulations (hereinafter: *Regulations*) is applicable to the matter at hand as to the substance.

4. The competence of the Chamber and the applicable regulations having been established, the Chamber entered into the substance of the matter. In this respect, the Chamber started by acknowledging the above-mentioned facts as well as the arguments and the documentation submitted by the parties.

5. The Chamber then reviewed the claim of the Claimant, who maintains that he terminated the employment contract on 11 August 2011 with just cause at the Respondent's fault. Therefore, he asks that the Respondent be ordered to pay compensation for breach of contract in the amount of EUR 638,500 plus interest at the rate of 5% as of 23 August 2011 as well as the amount of EUR 3,077 relating to the remainder of his February 2011 salary, the amount of EUR 2,300 in connection with alleged travel and accommodation costs, and a "management fee" of EUR 40,000.

6. The members of the Chamber noted that the Respondent, for its part, rejects the claim of the Claimant and alleges that the Claimant had no just cause to terminate the employment contract.

7. In order to be able to establish, first and foremost, as to whether, as claimed by the Claimant and contested by the Respondent, the player had terminated the employment contract with just cause, the Chamber proceeded with a more detailed analysis of the circumstances surrounding the present matter, the parties' arguments as well the documentation on file, bearing in mind art. 12 par. 3 of the Procedural Rules, in accordance with which any party claiming a right on the basis of an alleged fact shall carry the burden of proof.

8. In this sense, the members of the Chamber noted from the relevant loan agreement signed by and between the Claimant, the Respondent and the Club M, from country U on 22 January 2011 that the Claimant was transferred to said country U club on a loan basis until 31 May 2011.

9. Furthermore, the Chamber took into account that the Respondent had not refuted the Claimant's allegation that, subsequent to the aforementioned loan period, he was informed by the Respondent to look for another employer. As regards the Claimant's allegation that he was further told to join the club's training camp in country A should he not have found other employment by 13 July 2011, the Chamber noted that the Respondent, for its part, alleged that he was not invited to such training camp but instead instructed to go to country T in order to resume training there. In this respect, the Chamber noticed that the club failed to present documentation in support of its position that it had instructed the Claimant to join the team in country T in the period of time following the expiry of said loan period until the Claimant's first default notice of 20 July 2011. In fact, the documentation presented by the Respondent in support of its position relating to its alleged instructions to the Claimant to present himself in country T for the pre-season trainings consists of the Respondent's correspondence to the Claimant in reaction to the Claimant's letter of termination of 11 August 2011.

10. In this respect, the Chamber further took into account that the Respondent admitted that the Claimant had presented himself, albeit allegedly not invited, to the club in country A.

11. On account of the above, the members of the Chamber concurred that, apart from his default notice to the Respondent dated 20 July 2011, by his actions the Claimant had, in fact, offered his services to the Respondent subsequent to the expiry of the aforementioned loan period.

12. The Chamber took further note of the fact that by means of his default notices dated 20 July 2011 and 2 August 2011, apart from asking to be admitted to the team, the Claimant asked the Respondent to pay the monies that had allegedly fallen due in the interim, *i.e.* his salary for February 2011 and the instalment of EUR 135,000. The Respondent has not denied having received such letters from the Claimant, a copy of which was presented by the Claimant along with his statement of claim.

13. As regards the Claimant's salary for February 2011 amounting to EUR 10,000, the Chamber noted from the file that the Respondent paid the amount of EUR 6,923 to the Claimant on 19 August 2011 only. Consequently, at the time when the Claimant terminated the employment contract, *i.e.* on 11 August 2011, the full amount of EUR 10,000 had been outstanding. In this context, the Chamber rejected the Respondent's argument relating to the deduction of a fine amounting to EUR 3,077 from the aforementioned EUR 10,000, which was contested by the Claimant, since the Respondent failed to provide any valid argumentation or documentation relating to the imposition of such alleged fine.

14. The members of the Chamber then turned their attention to the allegation of the Respondent, who maintains that the Claimant was not entitled to receive the instalment of EUR 135,000 in July 2011. It was noted that the club, in this regard, referred to the aforementioned "pre-agreement" dated 1 July 2010, which does not include any specific due date for the payment of said amount of EUR 135,000 to the Claimant. However, the "agreement" signed between the parties on 13 July 2010, covering financial employment conditions for both the 2010-11 and the 2011-12 season, does stipulate that the amount of EUR 135,000 is payable by the Respondent to the Claimant before the end of July for the 2011-12 season. The Chamber further took into account that the Respondent referred to another agreement signed by the parties on 24 January 2011 with the purpose to temporarily *"freeze"* the player's registration until the end of the 2010-11 season, apparently on the occasion of the aforementioned loan of the player to the country U club. The members of the Chamber noted that in accordance with this

agreement and apparently with a view to enable the temporary transfer of the player to the country U club, the *"uniform contract registered with the country T FA",* referred to as dated 13 July 2010, was terminated. This latter agreement, however, clearly refers to the typical standard country T employment contract instead of the contract dated 13 July 2010 mentioned under number I./1. above, which was not made out in the form of said standard country T employment contract. The same agreement of 24 January 2011 further explicitly sets forth that the contract signed between the parties on 1 July 2010 shall continue to be in force.

15. On account of the above, the Chamber decided to reject the Respondent's arguments relating to the non-payment of the amount of EUR 135,000 to the Claimant and established on the basis of the documents on file that such payment was due by the Respondent to the Claimant in July 2011, at the start of the 2011-12 season.

16. Consequently, the Chamber concluded that at the time of the termination of the employment relation between the parties by the Claimant on 11 August 2011, the Claimant's full salary for February 2011 as well as the instalment of EUR 135,000 had remained outstanding.

17. Taking into account all of the above, the members of the Chamber concluded that the Respondent had no longer been interested in the Claimant's services and had acted in breach of contract by failing to respect its contractual obligations. Consequently, the Chamber decided that the Claimant had just cause to terminate the employment contract with the Respondent on 11 August 2011.

18. Thus, the Chamber established that the Respondent is to be held liable for the early termination of the employment contract with just cause by the Claimant on 11 August 2011.

19. Having established that the Respondent is to be held liable for the early termination of the employment contract with just cause by the Claimant, the Chamber focussed its attention on the consequences of such termination. Taking into consideration art. 17 par. 1 of the Regulations, the Chamber decided that the Claimant is entitled to receive an amount of money from the Respondent as compensation for the termination of the contract with just cause in addition to any outstanding payments on the basis of the relevant employment contract.

20. The Chamber then reverted to the Claimant's financial claim, which includes the aforementioned instalment of EUR 135,000, the amount of EUR 3,077 as the remainder of his February 2011 salary, the amount of EUR 2,300 relating to

alleged travel and accommodation costs as well as a "management fee" of EUR 40,000.

21. Taking into account the documentation remitted by the Claimant to substantiate his claim as well as the considerations under numbers II./13. and II./15. above, the Chamber decided that the Respondent is liable to pay to the Claimant the amount of EUR 138,077 in connection with the remuneration due to the Claimant in accordance with the relevant contract, corresponding to the instalment of EUR 135,000 due in July 2011 and the amount of EUR 3,077 as remainder of the salary of February 2011.

22. As regards the amount of EUR 2,300 for alleged travel and accommodation costs, which the Claimant alleges having paid on behalf the Respondent to a country N physician, the members of the Chamber concluded that the Claimant had failed to substantiate such claim with the required documentary evidence in accordance with art. 12 par. 3 of the Procedural Rules, which claim, thus, was rejected by the Chamber.

23. In addition, the Chamber decided to reject the Claimant's claim pertaining to a "management fee" of EUR 40,000, since no documentary evidence was presented demonstrating that such amount was payable by the Respondent to either the Claimant or Mr K.

24. In continuation, the Chamber focussed its attention on the calculation of the amount of compensation for breach of contract in the case at stake. In doing so, the members of the Chamber firstly recapitulated that, in accordance with art. 17 par. 1 of the Regulations, the amount of compensation shall be calculated, in particular and unless otherwise provided for in the contract at the basis of the dispute, with due consideration for the law of the country concerned, the specificity of sport and further objective criteria, including, in particular, the remuneration and other benefits due to the Claimant under the existing contract and/or the new contract, the time remaining on the existing contract up to a maximum of five years, and depending on whether the contractual breach falls within the protected period.

25. In application of the relevant provision, the Chamber held that it first of all had to clarify as to whether the pertinent employment contract contains a provision by means of which the parties had beforehand agreed upon an amount of compensation payable by the contractual parties in the event of breach of contract. The Chamber established that no such compensation clause was included in the employment contract at the basis of the matter at stake.

26. As a consequence, the members of the Chamber determined that the amount of compensation payable by the Respondent to the Claimant had to be assessed in application of the other parameters set out in art. 17 par. 1 of the Regulations. The Chamber recalled that the said provision provides for a non-exhaustive enumeration of criteria to be taken into consideration when calculating the amount of compensation payable. Therefore, other objective criteria may be taken into account at the discretion of the deciding body.

27. The members of the Chamber then turned their attention to the remuneration and other benefits due to the Claimant under the existing contract and/or the new contract, which criterion was considered by the Chamber to be essential. The members of the Chamber deemed it important to emphasise that the wording of art. 17 par. 1 of the Regulations allows the Chamber to take into account both the existing contract and the new contract in the calculation of the amount of compensation.

28. In accordance with the employment contract signed by the Claimant and the Respondent, which was to run for one more season after the breach of contract occurred, *i.e.* until 31 May 2012, the Claimant was to receive remuneration amounting to EUR 232,500 bearing in mind that the lump sum instalment of EUR 135,000 due in July 2011 for the 2011-12 season was included in the calculation of the outstanding remuneration (cf. point II./21. above). Said amount of EUR 232,500 consists of the amount of EUR 135,000 which was payable in 10 monthly instalments throughout the 2011-12 season plus the amount of EUR 97,500 relating to per match payments for the same season, which were considered guaranteed for 75% in accordance with the contractual terms. Consequently, the Chamber concluded that the amount of EUR 232,500 serves as the basis for the final determination of the amount of compensation for breach of contract.

29. The Chamber then took due note of the employment situation of the Claimant after the termination of the employment contract with the Respondent and of the relevant new employment contracts that he had entered into. It was duly noted that, on 1 September 2011, the player signed an employment contract with the Club P, from country S, as an "amateur", valid until 15 December 2011 in accordance with which he was to receive a monthly allowance of currency of country S 50,000. On 1 January 2012, the player signed an employment contract with the Club L, from country N, valid until 31 December 2012, in accordance with which the player was to receive a monthly salary of currency of country N 59,000, a signing-on fee of currency of country N 450,000 payable in 2 equal instalments of currency of country N 225,000 on 20 March 2012 and 20 August 2012, respectively, as well as an apartment up to the amount of currency of country N 8,000.

30. Hence, the Chamber concluded that on the basis of the aforementioned new employment contracts the Claimant has received income amounting to approximately EUR 73,900 as from September 2011 until the end of May 2012.

31. Consequently, bearing in mind art. 17 par. 1 of the Regulations and in accordance with the constant practice of the Dispute Resolution Chamber as well as the general obligation of the player to mitigate his damages, such remuneration under the new employment contract(s) shall be taken into account in the calculation of the amount of compensation for breach of contract.

32. In its analysis of the amount of compensation, the Chamber recalled that the Claimant had requested that the amount to be received as compensation be increased due to the fact that he would be subjected to country G taxation. The Chamber unanimously decided that such request could not be taken into consideration, in the light of the Chamber's lack of competence regarding tax-related issues.

33. Consequently, on account of all of the above-mentioned considerations and the specificities of the case at hand, the Chamber decided to partially accept the Claimant's claim and that the Respondent must pay not the entire residual value of the employment contract, but the amount of EUR 120,000.

34. In addition, taking into account the Claimant's request as well as the constant practice of the Dispute Resolution Chamber in this regard, the Chamber decided that the Respondent must pay to the Claimant interest of 5% *p.a.* on the amount of compensation as of the date of the present decision, *i.e.* 4 October 2013 until the date of effective payment.

35. Furthermore, the Dispute Resolution Chamber decided to reject the Claimant's claim pertaining to legal costs in accordance with art. 18 par. 4 of the Procedural Rules and the Chamber's respective longstanding jurisprudence in this regard.

36. The Chamber concluded its deliberations in the present matter by rejecting any further request(s) filed by the Claimant.

III. Decision of the Dispute Resolution Chamber

1. The claim of the Claimant, Player S, is partially accepted.

2. The Respondent, Club K, has to pay to the Claimant outstanding remuneration in the amount of EUR 138,077 within 30 days as from the date of notification of this decision.

3. If the amount of EUR 138,077 is not paid by the Respondent to the Claimant within said 30 days' time limit, interest at the rate of 5% *p.a.* will fall due on the amount of EUR 138,077 as of expiry of the time limit until the date of effective payment.

4. The Respondent has to pay to the Claimant, within 30 days as from the date of notification of this decision, compensation for breach of contract in the amount of EUR 120,000 plus interest at 5% *p.a.* as of 4 October 2013 until the date of effective payment.

5. If the above-mentioned amounts are not paid by the Respondent to the Claimant within the aforementioned time limits, the matter will be submitted, upon request, to the FIFA Disciplinary Committee for its consideration and decision.

6. Any further request filed by the Claimant is rejected.

7. The Claimant is directed to inform the Respondent directly and immediately of the account number to which the remittance is to be made and to notify the Dispute Resolution Chamber of every payment received.

*****

Note relating to the motivated decision (legal remedy):

According to art. 67 par. 1 of the FIFA Statutes, this decision may be appealed against before the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS). The statement of appeal must be sent to the CAS directly within 21 days of receipt of notification of this decision and shall contain all the elements in accordance with point 2 of the directives issued by the CAS, a copy of which we enclose hereto. Within another 10 days following the expiry of the time limit for filing the statement of appeal, the appellant shall file a brief stating the facts and legal arguments giving rise to the appeal with the CAS (cf. point 4 of the directives). The full address and contact numbers of the CAS are the following:

Court of Arbitration for Sport
Avenue de Beaumont 2
1012 Lausanne
Switzerland
Tel: +41 21 613 50 00
Fax: +41 21 613 50 01
e-mail: info@tas-cas.org
www.tas-cas.org

For the Dispute Resolution Chamber:

Markus Kattner
Deputy Secretary General

Encl.: CAS directives