

# **Decision of the Dispute Resolution Chamber**

passed in Zurich, Switzerland, on 30 May 2006,

in the following composition:

**Slim Aloulou** (Tunisia), President

**Gerardo Movilla** (Spain), Member

**John Didulica** (Australia), Member

**Paulo Amoretty Souza** (Brazil), Member

**Ivan Gazidis** (United States), Member

in a dispute between the

**Club A,**

the

**Player B,**

and the

**Club C,**

regarding the breach of an employment contract and  
the inducement to breach an employment contract.

## I. Facts of the case

1. On 1 February 2005, the player B (hereinafter; the player) and the club A (hereinafter; club A) signed an employment contract, valid from the date of signature until 30 June 2008, stipulating the following financial rights of the player:
  - lump sum, due until 28 February 2005 EUR 200,000
  - monthly salary February to June 2005 EUR 40,000
  - match bonus when summoned EUR 5,000
  - bonus for first ten summons EUR 75,000
  - total for season 2005/06 EUR 708,000 plus match bonuses
  - total for season 2006/07 EUR 708,000 plus match bonuses
  - total for season 2007/08 EUR 904,000 plus match bonuses
2. Furthermore, in particular, the following clauses of the relevant employment contract may have an impact on the matter:
  - 5.1: The player may cancel the contract in case of continuous violation of the club's obligations three days after having exhausted the rights indicated in clause 5.5 of the contract.
  - 5.4: In case of delayed payment by the club for more than 90 days, the player has the right to complain.
  - 5.5: The player has to address any complaint against the club to the club's administrator. In case the issue is not resolved within ten days, the player has to address his claim to the club's committee, the sub-committee, or the secretariat, which deals with the issue within two weeks.
  - 6.1: The player may unilaterally terminate the employment contract at any time for the payment of EUR 10 Mio. to club A.
3. On 2, 19, and 30 May 2005, the players' agent Mr. X, on behalf of the player, set club A on default for the non payment of the total amount of EUR 262,000.
4. On 13 June 2005, the player notified club A that he unilaterally terminates the employment contract due to non-respect of its financial obligations towards him by the club in the amount of EUR 262,000.

5. On 15 June 2005, the player signed a new employment contract with the club C (hereinafter; club C), valid as of 1 July 2005 until the end of the sports season 2008/09, stipulating the following financial rights of the player:
- lump sum due on 10 August 2005                      EUR 125,000
  - lump sum due on 10 September 2005                  EUR 125,000
  - monthly salary for season 2005/06                    EUR 80,000
  - monthly salary for season 2006/07                    EUR 85,000
  - monthly salary for season 2007/08                    EUR 90,000
  - monthly salary for season 2008/09                    EUR 95,000

### **Claim of the player**

6. On 14 June 2005, the player submitted a claim before FIFA against club A, requesting that his unilateral termination of the employment contract is declared as justified due to club A's continuous non-respect of its financial obligations.
7. Furthermore, the player claimed for the payment of outstanding contractual sums by club A in the total amount of EUR 262,000, as well as for compensation for breach of contract in the amount of the rest value of the relevant contract.
8. Finally, the player demanded that sporting sanctions for breach of contract deemed appropriate by the Dispute Resolution Chamber (DRC) shall be applied on club A.
9. The player specified his claim by means of the following breakdown:
- amounts due until his termination of the contract
    - lump sum    EUR 200,000
    - salaries February to May 2005                      EUR 160,000
    - total bonuses for 16 summons                      EUR 80,000
    - additional collective bonus                            not specified
    - bonus for first ten summons                        EUR 75,000
    - total due    EUR 515,000
  - paid    EUR 253,000
  - outstanding    EUR 262,000 + unspecified add. bonus

### **Position and counterclaim of club A**

10. Already on 15 June 2005, club A complained to FIFA that the player had not respected clause 6.1 of the employment contract when he unilaterally terminated such contract.
11. On 24 June 2005, club A submitted its position with regard to the player's claim, and thereby requested, on the one hand, that the financial claim of the player as well as his claim for sporting sanctions against club A shall be rejected entirely.
12. On the other hand, club A claimed for the enforcement of sporting sanctions against the player as well as for the payment of EUR 10 Mio. in application of clause 6.1 of the employment contract for unjustified breach of contract. Moreover, club A requested the reimbursement of its legal costs as well as an unspecified amount that was allegedly spent to sign a player replacing the player Franck Ribery.
13. In support of its position and counterclaim, club A first of all emphasized that the player did not follow the procedure stipulated in clause 5.5 of the employment contract when he terminated the same.
14. In this respect, club A also stressed that the contractually due payments were never delayed for more than 90 days, but at the maximum for 75 days.
15. Moreover, club A submitted a written statement dated 30 March 2005 and signed by the player, which reads as follows:

*"I hereby confirm that club A [...] has paid all of its contractual obligations on time."*
16. In view of this statement, club A stressed that only its financial obligations after 30 March 2005 shall be taken into consideration, but not the ones which became due before that date. Therefore, club A deemed that it had not failed to respect the employment contract in a manner that could lead to a justified unilateral termination by the player.
17. With regard to the reminders sent by the player via his agent, club A mentioned that it was never made aware that the person signing these reminders on behalf of the player was the representative of the player. Therefore, these reminders should be disregarded.

18. Finally, club A submitted the following list of payments made to the player:

○ until 13 June 2005	
▪ lump sum	EUR 200,000
▪ 7 match bonuses (matches until end of March 2005)	EUR 35,000
▪ 5/8 of a monthly salary	<u>EUR 25,000</u>
○ total until 13 June 2006	EUR 260,000
○ on 14 June 2005	
▪ 3/8 of a monthly salary	EUR 15,000
▪ 3 entire monthly salaries	EUR 120,000
▪ 10 match bonuses (matches as of April 2005)	EUR 50,000
▪ bonus for first ten summons	EUR 75,000
▪ additional bonus	<u>EUR 47,143</u>
○ total on 14 June 2006	<u>EUR 307,143</u>
○ total	EUR 567,143

19. On 5 July 2005, club A also submitted a request to FIFA against the club C for sporting sanctions due to alleged inducement to breach of contract.

20. In this respect, club A declared that in view of the facts of the issue, it appears obvious that the player and the club C jointly planned that the player terminates his employment contract with club A and shortly after that signs a new employment contract with the club C. Club A also assumed that the player and the club C negotiated the contract they signed on 15 June 2005 already when the player was still under contract with club A.

21. In view of this, and since according to club A the termination of the contract by the player was unjustified, the club C should be held responsible for inducement to breach of contract.

### **Answer of the player**

22. On 12 July 2005, the player submitted his answer with regard to the position and the counterclaim of club A.

23. Thereby, he modified his claim by stating that until his termination of the employment contract, he had received EUR 256,000, and on 14 June 2005, i.e. one day after the termination notice was served to club A, he was paid another EUR 259,000 and USD 59,400 (Note: approx. EUR 46,850).

24. With regard to the written statement signed by him on 30 March 2005, he stated that he did not understand what he was signing when he signed that document, since he does not speak any English. Moreover, he stressed that such written statement does not correspond to reality since even the club in its answer to the player's claim had acknowledged by submitting the mentioned list of payments that it had not respected all its financial obligations towards the player before 30 March 2005.
25. The player furthermore stated that the contractual clauses regarding the termination of the contract, e.g. clauses 5.1 and 5.5, were perfectly respected by him by means of the fact that club A had been set on default for the non-fulfilment of its financial obligations several times.
26. In this respect, the player also stated that club A was well aware that the players' agent Mr. X acted on his behalf, since the same already on 21 April 2005 notified the club that he was representing the player. Moreover, on 24 May 2005, the said players' agent had provided club A with a copy of the representation contract he had signed with the player on 15 April 2005.
27. In view of the above, the player reiterated his former request against club A that his unilateral termination of the employment contract shall be declared as justified due to club A's continuous non-respect of its financial obligations.
28. With regard to the financial claim, the player asserted that the salary for February 2005 in the amount of EUR 40,000 as well as collective match bonuses (not specified) are still outstanding.
29. Moreover, the player claimed for compensation in the amount of EUR 1,227,500 for the unjustified breach of contract. In this regard, the player mentioned that under the employment contract with club A, he would have earned the following amounts:
- |                  |                      |
|------------------|----------------------|
| ○ Season 2005/06 | EUR 895,500          |
| ○ Season 2006/07 | EUR 895,500          |
| ○ Season 2007/08 | <u>EUR 1,091,500</u> |
| Total            | EUR 2,882,500        |
30. According to the player, during the relevant period of time, he will allegedly be paid by his new club the club C the following amounts:
- |                  |                    |
|------------------|--------------------|
| ○ Season 2005/06 | EUR 605,000        |
| ○ Season 2006/07 | EUR 510,000        |
| ○ Season 2007/08 | <u>EUR 540,000</u> |
| Total            | EUR 1,655,000      |

31. The player left it up to the DRC to decide upon appropriate sporting sanctions against club A for unjustified breach of contract.

### **Answer of the club C**

32. On 26 July 2005, club C served its answer towards the counterclaim of club A, and in this respect first of all referred to the player's position according to which the early termination of the employment contract with the club A was justified.
33. Moreover, club C alleged that the negotiations with the player did not start before 14 June 2005, and stressed that the contract was signed only on 15 June 2005. Therefore, club C did not sign a contract with the player while the same was still bound to club A.
34. In consequence, club C is of the opinion not having induced the player to breach any employment contract.

### **Final position of club A**

35. On 6 October 2005, club A submitted its final position and in this respect first of all denied being obliged to pay collective match bonuses, since such bonuses are not stipulated in the employment contract.
36. Moreover, club A underlined that all monthly salaries were paid to the player from February to June 2005 and submitted payment receipts signed by the player regarding the payment of the lump sum on 8 and 11 February 2005, as well as for several payments of phone and internet bills for the player in the total amount of approximately USD 4,000.
37. Club A also objected to the claim for compensation of the player, since by accepting the new contract offered by club C the player did not try to mitigate his loss, which had been caused by himself through the termination of the contract with club A,.
38. Therefore, club A requested that the player's claim be rejected.
39. Moreover, club A claimed for compensation in the amount of EUR 10 Mio. in application of clause 6.1 of the employment contract as well as for the amount of EUR 1,780,000 for damages caused by the necessity of replacing the player by another player.

40. Furthermore, club A asked for sporting sanctions against the player and club C, for unjustified breach of contract respectively for inducement to breach of contract.
41. Finally, club A asked for the reimbursement of its legal costs.

### **Final position of the player**

42. On 17 November 2005, the player submitted his final position on the matter, and thereby underlined that he was indeed entitled to collective match bonuses, which can be deduced from the list of payments submitted by club A on 24 June 2005. According to this list, the player was paid on 14 June 2005 the amount of EUR 47,143 on account of a bonus added to the salary.

### **Final position of the club C**

43. On 17 November 2005, club C submitted its final position on the matter, and thereby, categorically rejected having negotiated any possible employment contract with the player before the termination of the player's contract with club A. Furthermore, club C reiterated that the termination of the contract by the player was justified.
44. In view of the above, club C asked for any claim for compensation for breach of contract to be rejected. Moreover, club C requested that sporting sanctions shall be applied on club A.

## **II. Considerations of the Dispute Resolution Chamber**

### **As to the competence of the Dispute Resolution Chamber**

1. First of all, the Dispute Resolution Chamber (DRC) analysed whether it was competent to deal with the matter at stake. In this respect, it referred to art. 18 par. 2 and 3 of the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Players' Status Committee and the Dispute Resolution Chamber (edition 2005). The claim of the player was submitted to FIFA on 14 June 2005, the counterclaim of club A on 24 June 2005, as a consequence the DRC concluded that the previous Procedural Rules (edition 2001) on matters pending before the decision making bodies of FIFA are applicable to the matter at hand. This shall apply as well on the claim of club A against club C for inducement to breach of contract, regardless of the fact that it was submitted on 5 July 2005 only, because it has to be considered as an extension of club A's initial counterclaim dated 24 June 2005.

2. With regard to the competence of the DRC, art. 42 par. 1 lit. (b) (i) of the FIFA Regulations for the Status and Transfer of Players (edition 2001) establishes that the triggering elements of an employment-related dispute (i.e. whether a contract was breached, with or without just cause, or sporting just cause), will be decided by the DRC.
3. If an employment contract is breached by a party, the DRC is also responsible to verify and decide whether a party is accountable for outstanding payments and/or compensation. Equally, the DRC shall decide whether sporting sanctions shall be imposed (art. 42 par. 1 lit. (b) (ii) and (iii) in connection with art. 21 and following of the aforementioned Regulations).
4. As a consequence, the DRC is the competent body to decide on the present litigation involving a club from one country and a player as well as a club from another country regarding a dispute in connection with the breach of an employment contract and the inducement to breach an employment contract.
5. Subsequently, the members of the Chamber analyzed which edition of the Regulations for the Status and Transfer of Players should be applicable as to the substance of the matter. In this respect, the Chamber referred, on the one hand, to art. 26 par. 1 and 2 of the Regulations for the Status and Transfer of Players (edition 2005) and, on the other hand, to the fact that the claim by the player was lodged at FIFA on 14 June 2005, the counterclaim of club A on 24 June 2005. In view of the aforementioned, the Chamber concluded that the former FIFA Regulations for the Status and Transfer of Players (edition 2001, hereinafter: the Regulations) are applicable to the case at hand as to the substance. In view of the above outlined reasoning, the same does apply as well on the claim of club A against club C.

### **As to the substance**

6. Entering into the substance of the matter, the DRC acknowledged the documentation contained in the file, and in view of the circumstances of the issue, focused on the questions whether an unjustified breach of the employment contract between the player and club A occurred and which party is responsible for such breach of contract, whether inducement to breach of contract occurred, and if sanctions for breach of contract and inducement to breach of contract have to be applied.

*Responsibility for the breach of contract*

7. As far as the question of the responsibility for the breach of contract is concerned, the DRC first of all acknowledged that during the effective validity of the employment contract between the player and club A, i.e. from the coming into force of the contract on 1 February 2005 until its unilateral termination by the player on 13 June 2005, the payment of the following amounts to the player became due according to the employment contract:
- lump sum until 28 February 2005            EUR 200,000
  - monthly salary February 2005            EUR 40,000
  - monthly salary March 2005                EUR 40,000
  - monthly salary April 2005                EUR 40,000
  - monthly salary May 2005                 EUR 40,000
  - 17 match bonuses (number acc. to club) EUR 85,000
  - bonus for first ten summons              EUR 75,000
  - total    EUR 520,000
8. According to the player, the amount of EUR 256,000 was paid to him between 1 February and 13 June 2005, and the amount of EUR 262,000, plus several unspecified bonuses, were still outstanding or paid only after the unilateral termination.
9. According to club A, the amount of EUR 260,000 was paid to the player until 13 June 2005. In this respect, the DRC acknowledged in particular the payment receipts signed by the player submitted by club A regarding the payment of the lump sum in the amount of EUR 200,000 and several phone and internet bills for the player in the amount of approximately USD 4,000, giving evidence for a part of the payments allegedly done by club A to the player. On 14 June 2005, i.e. one day after the unilateral termination of the employment contract by the player, according to club A, the amount of EUR 307,143 was remitted to the player.
10. Moreover, club A submitted a declaration signed by the player, according to which club A had respected all its financial obligations towards the player until 30 March 2005 (hereinafter; the declaration).
11. The contents of this declaration were contested by the player by stating in particular that he did not understand what he was signing when he signed such declaration, since he does not speak any English. Moreover, the player stressed that the contents of the declaration do not correspond to reality since even club A in its answer to his claim had acknowledged that it had not respected all its financial obligations towards him before 30 March 2005.

12. With regard to the declaration, the DRC calculated that according to the employment contract, until 30 March 2005, EUR 200,000 as a lump sum, two monthly salaries in the total amount of EUR 80,000, plus match bonuses for seven matches (number according to club A) in the total amount of EUR 35,000, therefore the total amount of EUR 315,000 had become due at least.
13. However, according to club A's own submission to FIFA of 24 June 2005, until 13 June 2005 only the amount of EUR 260,000 was paid to the player.
14. Thus, the DRC was of the opinion that the relevancy and trueness of the contents of the declaration are indeed questionable, and as a result concluded that only the list of payments submitted by club A to FIFA on 24 June 2005 shall be considered as reliable and therefore be taken into account when deciding on the matter at hand.
15. As a result to the above, and regardless of whether the position of the player (EUR 256,000 paid) or the position of club A (EUR 260,000) be taken into consideration, it appears to be uncontested that until the date of unilateral termination of the employment contract by the player, around 50% of the amount which had become due during the effective validity of the employment contract (EUR 520,000) had not been paid to the player by club A.
16. In continuation, and still in order to determine the responsibility for the breach of contract, the DRC turned to the statement of club A that the player had not respected the contractually agreed formal prerequisites for a unilateral termination, contained in particular in the clauses 5.1, 5.4 and 5.5 of the relevant employment contract, and therefore should be held liable for unjustified breach of contract.
17. In this respect, the Chamber noted that, resuming the relevant contractual clauses, an outstanding salary payment that is 90 days late needs to be communicated by the player to the club's administrator, who has a delay of 10 days to resolve the matter. If no solution is found, the club's committee, sub-committee, or secretariat has another 14 days to deal with the issue. Only three days after having gone through this procedure, i.e. after a delay of payment of 117 days, could the player cancel the contract and turn to FIFA or to the competent national labour courts in the country of club A.

18. After a thorough analysis of the admissibility of the clauses in question, the DRC came to the conclusion that they, in essence, serve to extend the contractually stipulated payment deadlines of club A. Unquestionably, an extension of the delay for lodging a claim on unpaid salaries of 117 days is considerable since it is limiting the player in exercising one of his basic rights resulting from the employment contract. Therefore, even if these clauses have been accepted by a player in an employment contract, the DRC considered that the period of 117 days is certainly excessively stretching the admissibility of the clauses 5.1, 5.4 and 5.5 of the employment contract at the basis of the present litigation.
19. Finally, the DRC emphasised that the player's failure in complying with the aforementioned procedural rules set out in the employment contract does not alter the fact that club A had not respected more than 50% of its contractually agreed financial obligations towards the player during the effective validity of the employment contract. Equally, the Chamber pointed out that, according to the list of payments submitted by club A, at the time of the unilateral termination of the employment contract, at least, the delay for the payment of certain salaries (part of February 2005) had been of more than 90 days and of others (March 2005) of 75 days.
20. After having outlined the above, the DRC stated that, as a general rule, the persistent failure of a club to respect its financial obligations towards a player without just cause is to be considered as an unjustified breach of an employment contract by the club.
21. In this regard, the DRC had to deliberate whether or not the behaviour of club A has to be considered as a persistent failure of the club to comply with its financial obligations towards the player.
22. In the present case, as mentioned before, according to both the player's and club A's positions, during the effective validity of the contract, the club A had not paid to the player around 50% of the amounts which had become due within this period of time.
23. In view of this, the DRC was of the unanimous opinion that the behaviour of club A, i.e. the non-payment of a considerable part of the amounts which had become due during the effective validity of the relevant employment contract, has to be considered as a persistent failure of club A to comply with its financial obligations towards the player, and therefore as a breach of contract by club A.

24. Moreover, the Chamber deemed that club A's failure of complying with its financial obligations, and not the player's disregard of the formal requirements for a unilateral termination established in the contract, were the cause for the breach of the employment contract.
25. Consequently, the DRC had to analyse if club A had any reason justifying the non-payment of the remuneration in question. In this regard, the DRC, however, acknowledged that club A had not submitted any reason justifying the non-respect of its financial obligations towards the player.
26. In conclusion, the DRC decided that club A had breached the employment contract in question without just cause. Therefore, in a further step of this decision, the consequences of such breach of contract shall be determined.

*Consequences of the unjustified breach of contract*

27. First of all, the DRC emphasized that, in view of its decision that club A was responsible for the breach of contract, and not the player, the latter could not be condemned to pay any compensation to club A, neither in application of the Regulations of FIFA, nor in accordance with clause 6.1 of the employment contract between the player and club A. Equally, club C could not be jointly and severally liable for the payment of any compensation to be paid by the player.
28. Moreover, no sporting sanctions can be imposed on the player for breach of contract and on club C for inducement to breach of contract, since club A breached the relevant contract without just cause and the player was therefore entitled to terminate the employment contract with club A.
29. In conclusion, the DRC decided that all requests by club A against the player as well as against club C shall be rejected.
30. The DRC then turned to the claim of the player against club A, and in this respect, acknowledged that he claimed for EUR 40,000, being the salary for February 2005, for unspecified collective match bonuses, and for compensation in the amount of EUR 1,227,500 for unjustified breach of contract.

31. The DRC first focused on the question if several payments which became due during the effective validity of the contract are still outstanding, and in this respect, had to calculate which was the exact amount which the player was entitled to for the effective duration of the contract according to the relevant agreement, and to that regard, draw up the following list:

○ lump sum until 28 February 2005	EUR 200,000
○ monthly salary February 2005	EUR 40,000
○ monthly salary March 2005	EUR 40,000
○ monthly salary April 2005	EUR 40,000
○ monthly salary May 2005	EUR 40,000
○ monthly salary 1 to 13 June 2005 (pro rata)	EUR 17,333
○ 17 match bonuses (number acc. to club)	EUR 85,000
○ bonus for first ten summons	<u>EUR 75,000</u>
total	EUR 537,333

32. With regard to the additional collective match bonuses the player alleged being entitled to, the DRC emphasized that the player neither specified the amount of such bonus nor outlined the principle of calculation of such claim or submitted the legal basis for this claim or any other clear evidence corroborating his allegation. In particular, the employment contract does not contain any obligation for club A to such payments. The Chamber was eager to emphasise that, if club A had made certain additional payments to the player, as indicated in the list of payments presented by the club A, without a specific contractual basis, such payments could not justify the player's claim for further such payments without any specification or legal grounds.

33. Therefore, in application of the principle of the burden of proof, and due to lack of evidence, the DRC had to reject the claim for additional bonuses of the player.

34. In continuation, the DRC considered that it had been acknowledged by the player that, finally, until 14 June 2005, he was paid by club A the total amount of EUR 515,000 and USD 59,400.

35. The amount to which the player was entitled to for the effective validity of the employment contract, according to the above drawn up list, has therefore been paid to the player in its entirety.

36. In continuation, the DRC had to verify and decide whether the player was entitled to compensation from club A for unjustified breach of contract, and in this respect, stated that as a general principle, in case of an unjustified breach of contract by a club, the latter has to pay to the player as compensation for breach of contract, the entire remaining value of the contract, less the player's revenues during the period of time concerned.

37. Therefore, the DRC had to calculate the amount of the remainder of the value of the contract concluded between the player and club A in the present case:

○ monthly salary 14 to 30 June 2005 (pro rata)	EUR 22,667
○ monthly salary July 2005	EUR 40,000
○ total for season 2005/06	EUR 708,000
○ total for season 2006/07	EUR 708,000
○ total for season 2007/08	<u>EUR 904,000</u>
total	EUR 2,382,667

38. Moreover, the DRC had to establish on the basis of the relevant new employment contract the amount of revenues of the player during the period of time concerned with club C:

○ lump sum due on 10 August 2005	EUR 125,000
○ lump sum due on 10 September 2005	EUR 125,000
○ salary for season 2005/06 12 x EUR 80,000	EUR 960,000
○ salary for season 2006/07 12 x EUR 85,000	EUR 1,020,000
○ salary for season 2007/08 12 x EUR 90,000	<u>EUR 1,080,000</u>
total	EUR 3,310,000

39. In view of these figures, the DRC concluded that the player had a higher income under his new contract with club C than he would have had with club A. Moreover, the DRC underlined that it was absolutely irreproducible how the player could come to the conclusion that he would earn less with club C than he would have earned with club A.

40. In consequence, the DRC decided that club A does not have to pay any compensation to the player for the unjustified breach of contract.

41. In conclusion, the DRC decided that club A breached the employment contract without just cause. Therefore, club A's claims against the player and club C are rejected. As far as the player's claim for outstanding remuneration and compensation is concerned, the DRC decided that no payments are outstanding from club A to the player. Moreover, no compensation for breach of contract without just cause shall be due by club A to the player.

### **III. Decision of the Dispute Resolution Chamber**

1. The claim of the player is partially accepted.
2. It is established that the player breached the employment contract concluded with the club A with just cause.
3. Any further request of the player is rejected.
4. The counterclaim of the club A against the player and the club C is rejected.
5. According to art. 60 par. 1 of the FIFA Statutes this decision may be appealed before the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS). The statement of appeal must be sent to the CAS directly within 21 days of receiving notification of this decision and has to contain all elements in accordance with point 2 of the directives issued by the CAS, copy of which we enclose hereto. Within another 10 days following the expiry of the time limit for the filing of the statement of appeal, the appellant shall file with the CAS a brief stating the facts and legal arguments giving rise to the appeal (cf. point 4 of the directives).

The full address and contact numbers of the CAS are the following:

Château de Béthusy  
Avenue de Beaumont 2  
1012 Lausanne  
Switzerland  
Tel: +41 21 613 50 00  
Fax: +41 21 613 50 01  
[info@tas-cas.org](mailto:info@tas-cas.org)  
[www.tas-cas.org](http://www.tas-cas.org)

For the  
Dispute Resolution Chamber:

---

Urs Linsi  
General Secretary

Encl. CAS directives