Decision of the Dispute Resolution Chamber

passed in Zurich, Switzerland, on 20 August 2014,

in the following composition:

Thomas Grimm (Switzerland), Deputy Chairman
Taku Nomiya (Japan), member
Theo van Seggelen (Netherlands), member

on the claim presented by the player,

Player M, from country A

as Claimant/Counter-Respondent

against the club,

Club L, from country G

as Respondent/Counter-Claimant

and the club,

Club T, from country A

as Intervening Party

regarding an employment-related dispute arisen between the parties
I. Facts of the case

1. On 19 May 2008, Player M, from country A (hereinafter: player or Claimant/Counter-Respondent), and Club L, from country G (hereinafter: Club L or Respondent/Counter-Claimant), concluded an employment contract (hereinafter: contract) valid “for one year”.

2. Clause 7 a) of the contract states that: “If the CLUB delays any of the payment indicated in this contract for more than 60 […] consecutive days, the player shall have the right and option to terminate the contract and the Club will have to indemnify the player with an amount of the entire contract of the current as an indemnity. In order to exercise this right and option, the player shall first send a written notification to the Club by fax or by hand, and if the club does not pay the due amount within 10 […] days after receiving the notification, the player shall be free to terminate the contract with the indicated consequences for the Club”.

3. Clause 7 d) of the contract stipulates that “In all cases the Player is entitled to go directly to FIFA bodies (Dispute Resolution Chamber or any other replacing it) in order to solve the claim, asking his freedom and the agreed indemnity”. In addition, clause 11 of the contract states that “any dispute relating to this agreement or its termination, should be referred by either party to the FIFA bodies and to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) in Lausanne accordingly”.

4. The contract provides for a total remuneration of EUR 170,000 net payable by Club L to the player in ten equal instalments of EUR 17,000 each at the end of each month starting in September 2008 and ending in June 2009. In addition, the parties agreed on the following bonuses, all payable within ten days of the relevant accomplishments:
   • EUR 10,000 net if the player participates at least five minutes in more than twenty League games,
   • EUR 30,000 net if the club is not relegated to the second division at the end of the season,
   • EUR 10,000 net if the club is, at the end of the season, in a better position in the final League standings than in 10th position,
   • EUR 20,000 net if the club participates in the country G Cup Final,
   • EUR 30,000 net if the club would participate in the UEFA CUP in the following season.

Furthermore, the parties agreed that the player should receive a fully furnished apartment for himself and his family as well as five return air tickets for the player to country A.
5. On 1 December 2008, the player put Club L in default of payment of the total amount of EUR 51,000 for salaries as from September until November 2008 plus EUR 3,680 for outstanding remuneration related to the previous season. Furthermore, the player requested Club L to provide him with a copy of all the receipts issued in connection with his salaries and to regularise his visa situation.

6. On 10 December 2008, the player sent a second default notice, with essentially the same content, with the addition of a request for the air tickets stipulated in the contract and a warning that, in the event that the club would fail to comply with its obligations, he would terminate the contract.

7. The very same day, i.e. 10 December 2008, Club L responded to the player's correspondence dated 1 December 2008 stating that the player had received all the remuneration that he was entitled to in relation to the previous sporting season as well as the salaries for September and October 2008. Club L added that the salary for November 2008 would be paid to him in December 2008.

8. On 12 December 2008, the player terminated the contract and a day later, after receiving a reply from Club L, the player reiterated his position and informed Club L that he would consider the contract as terminated upon club’s responsibility.

9. On 23 December 2008, the player lodged a complaint against Club L before FIFA maintaining that Club L is to be held liable for breach of contract and compensation for breach of contract and he requested to be awarded the amount of EUR 209,908 plus 5% interest per year as set out below:
   - EUR 3,680 corresponding to the previous contract allegedly dated 14 July 2007 and valid for the 2007/08 season;
   - EUR 1,200 corresponding to the penalty the player allegedly had to pay since Club L failed to regularise his visa for the entire duration of the contract;
   - EUR 170,000 corresponding to the total contractual remuneration payable in ten equal instalments;
   - EUR 30,000 corresponding to bonuses included in the contract;
   - EUR 5,028 corresponding to air tickets to travel back to country A.

10. In its statement of defence, Club L rejected all claims of the player and stated that it paid the total amount of EUR 37,640, in cash, to the player as set out below:
    a) Outstanding amount corresponding to the 2007/08 season, i.e. EUR 3,640, on 16 September 2008;
b) EUR 34,000 corresponding to the monthly salaries of September and October 2008 as follows:
- EUR 17,000 on 16 September 2008;
- EUR 15,000 on 21 October 2008;
- EUR 1,000 on 4 November 2008;
- EUR 1,000 on 11 November 2008.

11. Consequently, according to Club L, it had only failed to pay the salary of November 2008, which was payable on 30 November 2008. However, since the player had sent reminders regarding the amount in dispute, the club offered him to collect his money at the club’s office on 15 December 2008. Nevertheless, instead of collecting his money, the player allegedly decided to leave Club L without valid reason. At this point, Club L underlined that the player had never complained about late payments in the previous season.

12. In addition, on the one hand, Club L stated that the player had terminated the contract on 13 December 2008 and left country G permanently; on the other hand it explained that, on 18 December 2008, the club decided to terminate the contract due to the player’s unjustified absence and abandonment of work. Moreover, on 22 December 2008, the club allegedly requested the termination of the contract before the “First Instance Dispute Resolution Chamber of the country G Football Federation” due to the player’s default. On 12 January 2009, said deciding body rendered a decision stating that “the employment contract dated 25/8/2008 by and between the litigants is terminated on 24/12/2008 by virtue of the termination of the [club] at the [player’s] default”.

13. With regard to the deciding body of the country G Football Federation, Club L stated that “the establishment of an independent arbitration tribunal at national level [would be] undisputed”. According to Club L, the legal framework of the above-mentioned decision was based on the Statutes of the country G Football Federation (edition 2008), the Regulations for the Status and Transfer of Players (edition 2008) and the Regulations for the proceedings before the Dispute Resolution Committee of First and Second Instance (edition 2002).

14. Finally, Club L added that it “was forced to proceed to this petition, since the country G Football Federation could not allow us sign another foreign player as a replacement for the [player], without having a final decision from its committees adjudicating accordingly”.

15. According to Club L, it is evidenced that the player had terminated the contract without just cause. In this respect, Club L sustained that the player had not received his salary for a few days only, which would not constitute a
breach of contract entitling the player to terminate the contract. Moreover, in line with art. 7 of the contract, the player would have been entitled to terminate the contract in case of a delay of 60 days only.

16. On 25 August 2010, Club L lodged a counterclaim against the player requesting that the player be ordered to pay the amount of EUR 45,000 “as compensation for the unilateral breach of contract by the player without just cause, reflecting the great sporting damage [the club] suffered as the [player] was the starter striker of [the club] as well as the time remaining for the expiry of the pertinent employment contract” less the amount of EUR 17,000 corresponding to the November 2008 salary, plus 5% interest and the reimbursement of the costs of proceedings.

17. In his reply to the counterclaim of Club L, the player stated that in order for a submission to a national tribunal to be valid, it has to be included in the employment contract. In the present matter, the employment contract does not make reference to a national tribunal, but to the FIFA deciding bodies. Furthermore, the player pointed out that he had not made any submission to the national tribunal, the reason why the tribunal – independent of its composition – cannot be considered as competent. The decision had been passed in the absence of the player. This is, according to the player, his right to defence has not been granted.

18. With regard the alleged payment of the claimed amounts, the player questioned the authenticity of the receipts presented by Club L alleging that he has not signed them. The player also underlined that Club L did not hand over a copy of these receipts to him before Club L presented them in its statement of defence. Furthermore, the player considered it odd that the club would have paid the salaries of September and October in advance, one and two weeks respectively, and not on the 30th of the month. The player asked that the club provide not only the originals of the receipts in dispute, but also the ones of the previous season in order to be able to compare them.

19. Concerning the amount claimed as compensation by Club L, the player first of all highlighted that Club L has failed to provide evidence of the sporting damage suffered, although it carries the burden of proof. Moreover, the player held that Club L did not claim damages against him before the national tribunal, on the contrary, when the International Transfer Certificate (ITC) was finally issued by the country G Football Federation on 19 August 2009, it was certified that the player had duly fulfilled all his obligations towards his former club, i.e. Club L. According to the player, Club L violated the principle of prohibition of “venire contrafactum propium”.

Player M, from country A / Club L, from country G / Club T, from country A
20. With regard to his contractual situation following the termination of the contract with Club L, the player maintained that, due to injury, he could not join another club before July 2009.

21. Despite having been invited by FIFA to do so, Club T, from country A (hereinafter: Intervening Party), did not submit any comments with regard to the present matter.

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 matter at hand. In this respect, it took note that the present matter was submitted to FIFA on 23 December 2008. 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. 1 and par. 2 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 would, in principle, be competent to deal with the matter at stake, which concerns an employment-related dispute with an international dimension between a country A player and a country G club and involving an country A club.

3. However, the Chamber noted that, on 12 January 2009, the “First Instance Dispute Resolution Chamber of the country G Football Federation” passed a decision on the basis of a claim that was lodged in front of it by the Respondent/Counter-Claimant against the Claimant/Counter-Respondent for breach of contract and, therefore, the Chamber first had to establish as to whether it could adjudicate the present matter in the light of the principle of res iudicata.

4. In this context, the members of the Chamber took into account that the employment contract at the basis of the present matter contains a clear jurisdiction clause in favour of FIFA’s deciding bodies and that the parties have not contested FIFA’s jurisdiction to deal with the present matter. In addition, the Chamber took into consideration that according to the decision passed by the “First Instance Dispute Resolution Chamber of the country G Football Federation”, the Claimant/Counter-Respondent “of unknown residency” could not be informed about Club L’ claim and consequently, he was neither present.
nor represented at the hearing of said deciding body of the country G Football Federation. Consequently, the Chamber concluded that the player’s right to be heard had not been safeguarded.

5. For these reasons, the members of the Chamber agreed to disregard the decision passed by the “First Instance Dispute Resolution Chamber of the country G Football Federation” on 12 January 2009 and decided that the DRC is competent to adjudicate the present matter.

6. Having established its competence to deal with the present matter, 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 2 of the Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players (2014), and considering that the present claim was lodged on 23 December 2008, the 2008 edition of said regulations (hereinafter: Regulations) is applicable to the matter at hand as to the substance.

7. 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 all the above-mentioned facts as well as the arguments and the documentation submitted by the parties. However, the Chamber emphasised that in the following considerations it will refer only to the facts, arguments and documentary evidence, which it considered pertinent for the assessment of the matter at hand.

8. In this respect, the Chamber acknowledged that, on 19 May 2008, the Claimant/Counter-Respondent and the Respondent/Counter-Claimant signed an employment contract valid “for one year”.

9. The Claimant/Counter-Respondent, on the one hand, maintains that the Respondent/Counter-Claimant is to be held liable for breach of contract, as Club L had failed to comply with its financial obligations since September 2008, as a result of which he terminated the employment contract on 12 December 2008. Consequently, according to the player, the Respondent/Counter-Claimant is to be held liable for the early termination of the employment contract and, thus, to payment of compensation in addition to allegedly outstanding remuneration.

10. The Chamber further noted that the Respondent/Counter-Claimant rejected the claim and held that the Claimant/Counter-Respondent terminated the employment contract without just cause, on the basis of which it lodged a counterclaim against the Claimant/Counter-Respondent asking to be awarded compensation for breach of contract.
11. Considering the diverging position of the parties, the members of the Chamber highlighted that the central issue in this dispute was to determine as whether the Claimant/Counter-Respondent had terminated the employment contract on 12 December 2008 with or without just cause as well as to decide on the consequences thereof.

12. Subsequently, the Chamber proceeded with an 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.

13. In this respect, the members of the Chamber recalled that clause 7 a) of the employment contract sets forth a termination procedure, in accordance with which the player was entitled to terminate the employment contract, in the event that Club L was in delay of any payment for more than 60 consecutive days, after previously having put Club L in default in writing. In this context, it was duly noted that the ten monthly instalments of EUR 17,000 each fell due by the end of the month as from September 2008 until June 2009.

14. In continuation, the Chamber noted that, after having put the club in default, on 1 and 10 December 2008, of payment of his salaries for September and November 2008 as well as air tickets and the amount of EUR 3,680 corresponding to remuneration for the previous season, the Claimant/Counter-Respondent terminated the employment contract in writing on 12 December 2008.

15. The Respondent/Counter-Claimant, for its part, held that it duly paid the player’s remuneration for the previous season as well as the September and October 2008 instalments and, in support of its position, presented various receipts bearing the player’s signature and demonstrating the amounts paid by Club L to the Claimant/Counter-Respondent relating to the amount claimed for previous season as well as the September and October 2008 instalments. The Chamber noted that the Claimant/Counter-Respondent denied that he signed these receipts and that he questioned the authenticity of these receipts.

16. At this stage, the DRC considered it appropriate to remark that, as a general rule, FIFA’s deciding bodies are not competent to decide upon matters of criminal law, such as allegedly falsified signatures or documents, and that such affairs fall within the jurisdiction of the competent national criminal authority.
17. In continuation, the members of the Chamber pointed out that the Respondent/Counter-Claimant submitted the originals of the various receipts, which appear to be genuine.

18. As a result, the members of the Chamber rejected the Claimant/Counter-Respondent's allegations and concurred that the Respondent/Counter-Claimant corroborated its position with regard to the payments remitted to the player with sufficient documentary evidence.

19. What is more, as regards the November 2008 instalment, though, the Respondent/Counter-Claimant acknowledged that it had not yet been remitted to the Claimant/Counter-Respondent by the time the latter terminated the employment contract.

20. On account of the above, the Chamber concluded that at the time when the Claimant/Counter-Respondent terminated the employment contract, i.e. 12 December 2008, the Claimant/Counter-Respondent's remuneration for one month only, that is, the month of November 2008, had not been paid.

21. Furthermore, the preceding consideration, in particular the fact that solely the November 2008 instalment had remained outstanding at the time when the Claimant/Counter-Respondent terminated the employment contract, led the Chamber to conclude that the Claimant/Counter-Respondent had not complied with the termination procedure outlined in art. 7 of the employment contract.

22. Taking into account all of the above, the Chamber decided that the Claimant/Counter-Respondent had no just cause to terminate the employment contract on 12 December 2008. Hence, the members of the Chamber decided that the Claimant/Counter-Respondent is to be held liable for the early termination of the employment contract without just cause.

23. In continuation, prior to establishing the consequences of the termination of the employment contract without just cause by the Claimant/Counter-Respondent in accordance with art. 17 par. 1 of the Regulations, the Chamber held that it had to address the issue of any unpaid remuneration at the moment the employment contract was terminated by the Claimant/Counter-Respondent.

24. In this regard, the members of the Chamber recalled that, as claimed by the Claimant/Counter-Respondent and acknowledged by Club L, the player’s remuneration for November 2008 had remained unpaid.
25. The members of the Chamber further took into account that the Respondent/Counter-Claimant had no valid reasons justifying such the non-payment of the November 2008 instalment. Consequently, the Chamber decided that, in virtue of the principle *pacta sunt servanda*, the Respondent/Counter-Claimant is liable to pay to the Claimant/Counter-Respondent the amount of EUR 17,000 that had remained outstanding in accordance with the employment contract on the day on which the Claimant/Counter-Respondent terminated the employment contract without just cause. Moreover, the Chamber decided that the Claimant/Counter-Respondent is entitled to receive the amount of EUR 6,580 for services rendered in December 2008 until the termination of the contractual relation.

26. The members of the Chamber then turned their attention to the Claimant/Counter-Respondent’s claim relating to flight tickets to country A and decided to reject such claim, since the Claimant/Counter-Respondent is liable for the early termination of the employment contract without just cause.

27. Furthermore, as regards the Claimant/Counter-Respondent’s claim relating to a EUR 30,000 bonus, which was not further specified, in the absence of any documentary evidence demonstrating that the contractual conditions related to Claimant/Counter-Respondent’s entitlement to the bonus of EUR 30,000 in accordance with the employment contract were fulfilled (cf. art. 12 par. 3 of the Procedural Rules) and bearing in mind that the Claimant/Counter-Respondent rendered his services to Club L until mid-December 2008 only, the Chamber decided to reject the Claimant/Counter-Respondent’s claim pertaining to said amount. Likewise, in the absence of any documentary evidence, the Chamber decided to reject the claim of the Claimant/Counter-Respondent relating to costs allegedly incurred in connection with his visa.

28. Consequently, the Chamber decided that the Claimant/Counter-Respondent is entitled to receive outstanding remuneration totalling EUR 23,580 from the Respondent/Counter-Claimant. In addition, bearing in mind the Claimant/Counter-Respondent’s claim, the Chamber decided to award the Claimant/Counter-Respondent interest at the rate of 5% p.a. on the amount of EUR 23,580 as of the day on which the claim was lodged in front of FIFA, *i.e.* 23 December 2008.

29. Furthermore, the Chamber decided to reject any further claim lodged by the Claimant/Counter-Respondent.

30. Having established the above, the Chamber turned its attention to the question of the consequences of the termination of the employment contract by the Claimant/Counter-Respondent without just cause on 12 December 2008.
31. In doing so, the DRC established that, taking into consideration art. 17 par. 1 of the Regulations, the Claimant/Counter-Respondent is liable to pay compensation to the Respondent/Counter-Claimant for the termination of the employment contract without just cause. Furthermore, in accordance with the unambiguous contents of art. 17 par. 2 of the Regulations, the Chamber established that the player’s new club, i.e. the Intervening Party, shall be jointly and severally liable for the payment of compensation. In this respect, the Chamber was eager to point out that the joint liability of the player’s new club is independent from the question as to whether the new club has committed an inducement to contractual breach or any other kind of involvement by the new club. This conclusion is in line with the well-established jurisprudence of the Chamber that was repeatedly confirmed by the CAS.

32. In continuation, 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 player under the existing contract and/or the new contract, the time remaining on the existing contract up to a maximum of five years as well as the fees and expenses paid or incurred by the Respondent/Counter-Claimant (amortised over the term of the contract) and whether the contractual breach falls within a protected period.

33. 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 which the parties had beforehand agreed upon an amount of compensation payable by either contractual party in the event of breach of contract. Upon careful examination of said contract, the members of the Chamber assured themselves that this was not the case in the matter at stake.

34. The Chamber further recalled that the Respondent/Counter-Claimant had claimed compensation of, *inter alia*, EUR 45,000 as well as the time remaining on the relevant employment contract.

35. With regard to the calculation of the amount of compensation due by the Claimant/Counter-Respondent, the Chamber firstly turned its attention to the remuneration and other benefits due to the player under the existing contract and/or any new contract(s), a criterion which 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 any new contract(s) in the calculation of the amount of compensation.

36. In accordance with the player’s employment contract with Club L, which was to run for 6 months and 19 days more at the moment when the breach of contract occurred, the Claimant/Counter-Respondent was to receive the amount of EUR 112,420, i.e. EUR 10,420 for the remaining time of the month of December 2008 as well as EUR 102,000 as from January until June 2009. The Chamber further noted that the Claimant/Counter-Respondent had not signed any new employment contract during the original period of validity of the relevant employment contract with Club L.

37. In continuation, and referring to art. 12 par. 3 of the Procedural Rules, although bearing in mind that the Respondent/Counter-Claimant had not specifically included any of these costs in its claim, the Chamber established that it had no indications at its disposal regarding possible fees and expenses paid or incurred by the Respondent/Counter-Claimant for the acquisition of the player’s services and that therefore it could not further consider that criterion in the specific case at hand, whereas according to art. 17 par. 1 of the Regulations such fees and expenses may be included as one of the criteria to be taken into account in the calculation of the compensation.

38. For all these reasons, the Chamber decided that the Claimant/Counter-Respondent, Player M, has to pay the amount of EUR 112,420 to the Respondent/Counter-Claimant, the Club L, as compensation for the breach of contract without just cause. In this respect, the Dispute Resolution Chamber also decided that the Intervening Party, the Club T, is jointly and severally liable for the payment of the above-mentioned amount of compensation to Club L (cf. art. 17 par. 2 of the Regulations).

39. In addition, taking into account the request of the Respondent/Counter-Claimant, the Chamber decided that the Claimant/Counter-Respondent must pay to the Respondent/Counter-Claimant interest of 5% p.a. on the amount of compensation as of the date on which the counterclaim was lodged, i.e. 25 August 2010, until the date of effective payment.

40. Furthermore, as regards the claimed legal expenses, the Chamber referred to art. 18 par. 4 of the Procedural Rules as well as to its long-standing and well-established jurisprudence, in accordance with which no procedural compensation shall be awarded in proceedings in front of the Dispute Resolution Chamber. Consequently, the Chamber decided to reject the Respondent/Counter-Claimant’s request relating to legal expenses.
41. The Dispute Resolution Chamber concluded its deliberations in the present matter by establishing that any further request filed by the Respondent/Counter-Claimant is rejected.

III. Decision of the Dispute Resolution Chamber

1. The claim of the Claimant/Counter-Respondent, Player M, is partially accepted.

2. The Respondent/Counter-Claimant, Club L, has to pay to the Claimant/Counter-Respondent, within 30 days as from the date of notification of this decision, outstanding remuneration in the amount of EUR 23,580 plus interest at 5% p.a. as of 23 December 2008 until the date of effective payment.

3. Any further claim lodged by the Claimant/Counter-Respondent is rejected.

4. The counterclaim of the Respondent/Counter-Claimant, Club L, is partially accepted.

5. The Claimant/Counter-Respondent has to pay to the Respondent/Counter-Claimant, within 30 days as from the date of notification of this decision, compensation for breach of contract in the amount of EUR 112,420 plus interest at 5% p.a. as of 25 August 2010 until the date of effective payment.

6. The Intervening Party, Club T, is jointly and severally liable for the payment of the amount of compensation for breach of contract (cf. point 5 above).

7. Any further claim lodged by the Respondent/Counter-Claimant is rejected.

8. If the aforementioned sums plus interest are not paid within the aforementioned deadlines, the present matter shall be submitted, upon request, to the FIFA Disciplinary Committee for consideration and decision.

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

10. The Respondent/Counter-Claimant is directed to inform the Claimant/Counter-Respondent and the Intervening Party immediately and directly 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 article 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:

__________________________

Jérôme Valcke  
Secretary General

Encl. CAS directives