

[Operación Puerto: archivados los expedientes sin sanciones.](#) **AS**

[El Comité Paralímpico Internacional no levantará la sanción a Rusia tras los Juegos.](#) **ECO DIARIO**

[Hassan Pena suspendido por violar el programa antidopaje.](#) **RNV VENEZUELA**

[Castigan con cuatro años de suspensión a dos de los 12 ciclistas envueltos en escándalo de dopaje en la Vuelta a Costa Rica.](#) **LA NACIÓN (Costa Rica)**

[Could U.S. Law Help Punish Russians for Doping Scheme?.](#) **THE NEW YORK TIMES**

[WADA overkill? The Gordon Gilbert case.](#) **SPORTS INTEGRITY INITIATIVE**

[The trouble with Ostarine: Jimmy Wallhead's story.](#) **SPORTS INTEGRITY INITIATIVE**

AS

16/03/2018

OPERACIÓN PUERTO: ARCHIVADOS LOS EXPEDIENTES SIN SANCIONES



Saiz, Belda, Labarta y Yolanda Fuentes quedan exonerados por la Federación de Ciclismo pese a que se probó el dopaje, como confirmó As.

[J.A.Ezquerro](#)

La **Federación Española de Ciclismo (RFEC)** abrió **expedientes** disciplinarios **contra Manolo Saiz (Liberty), Vicente Belda, Ignacio Labarta y Yolanda Fuentes (Comunidad Valenciana) en 2006, cuando explotó la Operación Puerto**. Los cuatro, en posesión de licencia deportiva entonces. Casi doce años después, y tras la sentencia definitiva de la Audiencia Provincial de Madrid de 2016, al fin se han **cerrado sus casos**. Y la **RFEC los ha archivado sin castigos**, como confirmó As, pese a que en la resolución del magistrado Benito López **quedó probado que los acusados de la Operación Puerto recurrieron a prácticas dopantes**. Según esgrime la Federación: como no cuentan con licencia en la actualidad, no les sanciona. Aun así, Saiz dirige el Aldro Team Sub-23.

En los tribunales se juzgó un **presunto delito contra la salud pública**, ya que **ni siquiera había leyes antidopaje en 2006**. Los implicados, con Eufemiano Fuentes como cabecilla de la trama, **fueron absueltos porque no se consideró la sangre un medicamento**. Benito López entregó las bolsas a los organismos deportivos en un primer momento para su identificación, pero **revocó la orden para que no sirvieran para descubrir a los clientes de Eufemiano**. Con ese último revés de la justicia española, las opciones se reducían a rematar estos expedientes o a que la Agencia Mundial (AMA), a cargo de los análisis, desvelara los nombres.

Una puerta se ha cerrado y la otra parece totalmente atrancada. Los **abogados de la AMA piensan que la revelación resultaría inútil y atentaría contra la intimidad de los involucrados:**

no se impondrían suspensiones por la prescripción de los hechos, de la que culpan a todas las instituciones de España. La **Unión Ciclista Internacional (UCI) y la AMA pueden apelar y solicitar la reapertura de los expedientes**. La RFEC no tiene ningún interés en continuar con la causa y la **Agencia Nacional (AEPSAD) no dispone de potestad**: en 2006 tampoco existía, y el proceso se ha conducido con la normativa anterior a la Ley de 2013.

https://as.com/ciclismo/2018/03/15/mas_ciclismo/1521147092_293388.html

ECO DIARIO

15/03/2018

EL COMITÉ PARALÍMPICO INTERNACIONAL NO LEVANTARÁ LA SANCIÓN A RUSIA TRAS LOS JUEGOS

La suspensión de Rusia no será levantada justo después de los Juegos Paralímpicos que se celebran en Pyeongchang porque las autoridades deportivas rusas no han respondido a las exigencias establecidas tras el escándalo de dopaje institucionalizado, anunció este jueves el presidente del Comité Paralímpico Internacional (IPC) Andrew Parsons.

Parsons habló de la cuestión en una entrevista concedida a la AFP. El Comité Olímpico Internacional (COI) levantó la sanción tres días después de la finalización de los Juegos, pero el IPC optará por mantenerla.

"La situación es muy clara porque estamos de acuerdo sobre los criterios de reintegración con el Comité Paralímpico Ruso", explicó el hombre que preside el IPC desde hace seis meses.

"No podemos levantar la suspensión justo después de los Juegos porque hace falta que se responda a estos criterios", añadió.

Parsons se refiere a una respuesta oficial sobre las acusaciones de dopaje y la reintegración de la agencia rusa antidopaje por la Agencia Mundial Antidopaje (AMA).

El IPC, entidad independiente del COI, dictó la suspensión contra Rusia en 2016 y ningún deportista de este país participó en los Juegos Paralímpicos de Río.

Pero en los Juegos de Invierno de Pyeongchang permitió a 30 deportistas rusos participar bajo condiciones estrictas y bandera neutra, manteniendo la suspensión al país.

<http://ecodiario.economista.es/internacional/noticias/9006545/03/18/El-Comite-Paralimpico-Internacional-no-levantara-la-sancion-a-Rusia-tras-los-Juegos.html>

RNV VENEZUELA

15/03/2018

HASSAN PENA SUSPENDIDO POR VIOLAR EL PROGRAMA ANTIDOPAJE



La Junta Directiva de la Liga Venezolana de Beisbol Profesional anunció este jueves que el lanzador cubano Hassan Pena, miembro de los Navegantes del Magallanes, fue suspendido por violar el Programa Antidopaje de la LVBP (PALVBP) durante la temporada 2017-2018.

Pena dio positivo a una “Droga de Abuso”, tras someterse a una prueba realizada el 2 de enero de 2018. Fue el segundo positivo de Pena por consumo de una “Droga de Abuso”, así que la Junta Directiva de la LVBP, de conformidad con el numeral 14° del artículo 21 del Código de Ética y Disciplina de la LVBP y el literal “B” del artículo 29 del PALVBP, resolvió imponer una suspensión de veinticinco (25) juegos.

Es importante destacar que en la campaña 2016-2017, Pena resultó positivo por una “Droga de Abuso”. Sin embargo, de acuerdo con el PALVBP, esa situación no comportó suspensión, sino una evaluación y sometimiento a un programa de tratamiento.

Por mandato expreso de los artículos 5° y 26° del PALVBP, la Junta Directiva de la LVBP está obligada a mantener la confidencialidad de cada caso hasta que se imponga una sanción.

La Junta Directiva de la LVBP también informó, de conformidad con lo previsto en el artículo 34° del PALVBP, la decisión de dejar sin efecto el nombramiento de Pena como “Relevista del Año” de la temporada 2017-2018. En ese sentido, se notificará a la empresa Numeritos Gerencia Deportiva, ente encargado de los cálculos de ese galardón, para que determine quién sería el jugador que, de acuerdo con su desempeño, es merecedor de ese reconocimiento o tomare otra decisión que considere procedente.

El objetivo del Programa Antidopaje es ofrecer un espectáculo limpio a los aficionados y hacer conscientes a los jugadores de las repercusiones negativas que el uso de sustancias prohibidas puede ocasionar a su salud.

<http://rnv.gob.ve/hassan-pena-suspendido-por-violar-el-programa-antidopaje/>

LA NACIÓN

15/03/2018

CASTIGAN CON CUATRO AÑOS DE SUSPENSIÓN A DOS DE LOS 12 CICLISTAS ENVUELTOS EN ESCÁNDALO DE DOPAJE EN LA VUELTA A COSTA RICA

La UCI publicó la sanción para Vladimir Fernández y Melvin Mora, a quienes se les detectó CERA mediante un examen de sangre

Por: [Fanny Tayver Marín](#)



Vladimir Fernández no

podrá competir más durante cuatro años. Fotografía: Luis Barbosa, Fecoci

Vladimir Fernández y Melvin Mora se convirtieron en los primeros dos ciclistas en ser sancionados tras el escándalo de dopaje en la última edición de la Vuelta a Costa Rica, donde se detectaron 17 resultados analíticos adversos correspondientes a 12 corredores.

La Unión Ciclista Internacional (UCI) informó este miércoles, en su página electrónica, de que a ellos dos se les dictó un castigo de 4 años de suspensión, que rige desde el 22 de diciembre del 2017 hasta el 21 de diciembre de 2021.

Fernández, quien corría con el desaparecido Scott TeleUno y Mora, que portó el uniforme de Múltiples Corella, marcaron positivo en el control sanguíneo que se hizo ese 22 de diciembre, tras la cronoescalada entre Palomo y Paraíso.

Mediante los exámenes de sangre practicados a 25 ciclistas, a ellos dos y a otros nueve corredores (Juan Carlos Rojas, César Rojas, Leandro Varela, José Irias, Gabriel Marín, José Alexis Rodríguez, Jason Huertas, Kevin Murillo y Jordy Sandoval) se les halló rastros de CERA, mientras que Jeancarlo Padilla con EPO.

Tanto la EPO como la CERA ayudan a aumentar los glóbulos rojos, con lo que suben los niveles de hematocrito y hemoglobina. Eso influye en el rendimiento, porque da mayor fuerza y retarda o desaparece la sensación de cansancio.

El caso de ellos se resolvió de primero porque al parecer, Fernández y Mora respondieron muy pronto el cuestionario que les envió la UCI con la notificación del analítico adverso, no solicitaron la apertura de la contramuestra y admitieron su error.

Con los demás, habrá que esperar; principalmente porque Juan Carlos Rojas había dicho que solicitó la apertura de la contramuestra de él y de los seis hombres que lo acompañaron en el equipo Extralum Frijoles Tierníticos, escuadra que se desintegró pocos días después.

En una entrevista al sitio especializado criclismo.com, Rojas se declaró inocente, dijo que nunca había consumido sustancias prohibidas y que a su criterio, hubo manipulación de esas muestras, aduciendo que los controles son vulnerables.

Sin embargo, pocos días después, la UCI le informó a la Fecoci que en los controles de orina, también se detectó la presencia de testosterona y anabólicos derivados en tres de los muchachos que ya estaban suspendidos provisionalmente.

Y los que repitieron fueron los hermanos Rojas, ambos en dos muestras y Leandro Varela en una.

<https://www.nacion.com/puro-deporte/otros-deportes/castigan-con-cuatro-anos-de-suspension-a-dos-de/KRB5AFPKSVBJFUN5CGANGPPXE/story/>

THE NEW YORK TIMES

14/03/2018

COULD U.S. LAW HELP PUNISH RUSSIANS FOR DOPING SCHEME?

By [JULIET MACUR](#)



Travis Tygart, chief executive of the United States Anti-Doping Agency, on Capitol Hill on Tuesday. Credit Erin Schaff for The New York Times

WASHINGTON — In recent months, the United States has punished the following people for alleged human rights violations and corruption:

A former Gambian president who led terror and assassination squads. A Chechen leader involved in torture, kidnapping and murder. A Pakistani man at the center of a human-organ trafficking network.

And a former Russian sports minister who was implicated in a nation's systematic doping scheme that tainted several Olympics and other international competitions?

Well, not the last person — at least not yet.

The United States Anti-Doping Agency is exploring the use of government sanctions to punish Russian officials involved in the state-supported doping program that turned the 2014 Sochi Games into a sham. On Tuesday, Travis Tygart, the chief executive of the agency, attended a workshop here sponsored by the U.S. Helsinki Commission to see if the Global Magnitsky Act, a 2016 law that allows the sanctions, could apply to the Russians.

The law calls for individuals who have committed human rights violations or significant corruption to be barred from obtaining United States visas and blocked from using the American financial system, which effectively blacklists them from doing business with major world banks. Powerful, wealthy people don't like to have their assets frozen.

“What happened in Sochi was the worst case of corruption that we've ever seen in sport, so why shouldn't the act apply to us?” Tygart said. “We have to look down every avenue if we're working for clean athletes, particularly in light of the I.O.C.'s failure do anything.”

Continue reading the main story

A collection of columns offering opinion and analysis from the world of sports.

Tygart said American athletes have been demanding that the antidoping agency find ways to better protect clean athletes in the future so the Russian doping debacle is never repeated.

The International Olympic Committee punished Russia, sort of, for its widespread doping. It barred the Russian Olympic Committee, the Russian flag and the Russian national anthem from last month's Pyeongchang Games, while letting some Russian athletes compete under a neutral flag. It also barred for life one top Russian official: Vitaly Mutko. (He was implicated in the doping program as the Russian sports minister. After the scheme was exposed, he was promoted to deputy prime minister.)

Three days after the Pyeongchang Games ended, the I.O.C. reinstated Russia's Olympic committee — even though [two Russian athletes had failed drug tests](#) during the competition.

So the United States antidoping group is looking for additional ways to punish the Russians. The Global Magnitsky Act is in its infancy and the sports angle might be a long-shot, but why not try?

Besides, the United States government often has to do the dirty work for sports leagues and federations that refuse to police themselves.

To take down the principles and athletes involved in the Bay Area Laboratory Co-Operative steroids scandal that ensnared athletes like Barry Bonds and Marion Jones, law enforcement made arrests and prosecutors took it from there. To address the widespread doping problem in Major League Baseball, Congress had to drag players and management in to testify.

To uncover corruption in FIFA, United States prosecutors took the lead and indicted more than two dozen officials and businessmen from all over the world — much to the dismay of soccer's global establishment.

And now it could be the Global Magnitsky Act that delivers a staggering blow to the Russians for corrupting the results of major global sports competitions — including, but certainly not limited to, the Olympics.

He's covered Jordan. He's covered Kobe. And LeBron vs. the Warriors. Go behind the N.B.A.'s curtain with the league's foremost expert.

Among the people who could be targeted for sanctions are Mutko; Yuri D. Nagornykh, the former deputy sports minister; Irina Rodionova, the former deputy director of the Center for Sports Preparation; and others mentioned in an affidavit by Dr. Grigory Rodchenkov, Russia's former longtime antidoping laboratory chief [who blew the whistle on the whole operation](#).

Does such sports corruption rise to the level covered by the law? William F. Browder thinks so. He's a prominent investor who worked with Congress on the original Magnitsky Act, which was passed in 2012 in response to the death of Browder's Russian lawyer, Sergei L. Magnitsky. The lawyer had uncovered a \$230 million tax-theft scheme before he was arrested and died in prison.

"There's one important issue and that's the doping scandal at the Sochi Games led to what I believe were murders," Browder said, referring to two officials from Russia's antidoping agency who died within two weeks of each other in 2016. "There were a number of people involved who died very suspiciously who were most likely liquidated to cover up a crime."

He added: "There were people who effectively ruined institution of sport and have committed crimes to do so. That would reach the standard of Global Magnitsky, in my opinion. These people involved in sports doping, they're shameless. So there needs to be really hard consequences. They need to pay a very dear price."

That price would be losing access to their money and the freedom to move about the world. And they would be on a list with some of the world's worst criminals.

"If the Olympic Games are unquestionably tainted, that has huge economic ramifications for not just U.S. athletes, but for U.S. industry, and the U.S. government has an interest in making sure that doesn't happen," said Robert G. Berschinski, senior vice president for policy at Human Rights First and a former deputy assistant secretary of state.

I asked him if he thought the individuals involved in the Russian doping case could be sanctioned under the law. "Without getting into specifics," he said, "it seems that you can make a case."

Tygart thinks so, too. He left the workshop on Tuesday thinking that sanctions were a last resort but "a viable option."

Is it truly a viable option, and will the antidoping agency act on it?

A certain group of Russians might not be eager to learn the answers.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/14/sports/russia-doping-olympics.html>

SPORTS INTEGRITY INITIATIVE

16/03/2018

WADA OVERKILL? THE GORDON GILBERT CASE



[Andy Brown and Steven V. Selthoffer](#)

Something very strange is going on in South Africa. Two athletes sponsored by Biogen have returned an adverse analytical finding (AAF) for prohibited substances, after using a product manufactured by that company. Gordon Gilbert is a retired professional footballer who coaches children and who tested positive during a mountain bike race. Demarte Pena competes in the Ultimate Fighting Championships (UFC). In both cases, the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) is seeking to extend their sanctions to four years.

Both athletes returned an AAF for a steroidal precursor, 1,4-androstadiene-3,17-dione, and both AAFs were traced back to Testoforte for Stamina, produced by Biogen. The ingredient was not listed on the label, and both athletes had been told by Biogen, their sponsor, that their products were safe to use.

As Pena declared the use of the supplement on his Doping Control Form (DCF), he was sanctioned with a reprimand by the South African Institute for Drug Free Sport (SAIDS). Gilbert did not declare his use on the DCF, and received a six month sanction. Both cases were heard on [15 March](#) at the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS).

Athlete responsibility

An unfortunate reality of the World Anti-Doping Code is that athletes are ultimately responsible for any prohibited substances that turn up in their samples. If they test positive, it

is up to them to explain how those substances ended up in their sample. Therefore, although 1,4-androstadiene-3,17-dione was not listed on the Testoforte label, both athletes have had to defend themselves in a doping case.

Anti-doping is one of the few areas of jurisprudence where the burden of proof is on the athlete. Under the [2015 World Anti-Doping Code](#), athletes who return an AAF are subject to a four year ban as a starting point. However they can reduce this down to the minimum of a reprimand and the maximum of a two year ban, if they are able to meet the burden of evidence required to prove *'no significant fault or negligence'*.

The SAIDS panel in both cases accepted that the athletes had met the evidential burden required to establish *'no significant fault or negligence'* for testing positive for a substance that was not listed on the label. As mentioned, Pena received a reprimand, but Gilbert received a six month sanction. The reasons for the differences in sanction will be explained below.

Of course, all athletes diligently screen all product labels for any substances on the World Anti-Doping Agency's Prohibited List. They are not swayed by the fact that 43 anabolic androgenic steroids appear in just one category of the List. They are so diligent that the revelation that *'other substances with a similar chemical structure or similar biological effect(s)'* to those 43 are also banned does not worry them. Their expertise is such that the statement announcing that *'All selective and non-selective beta-2 agonists, including all optical isomers, are prohibited'* does not concern them. They become experts in analytical chemistry when they sign their Athlete Agreement, and are able to identify 1,4-androstadiene-3,17-dione as a steroidal precursor. Or perhaps not.

The cases

WADA is seeking a four year sanction for both athletes at CAS. Why? As mentioned, Gilbert received a six month ban on 30 August last year, after testing positive in a mountain bike race on 13 May 2016. Pena tested positive on 11 November 2016, after his EFC Africa bantamweight title against Irshaad Sayed.

Gilbert claims to have taken Testoforte on the advice of a friend, Brandon Fairweather, whilst Pena took it on the advice of a sports nutritionist, Rory Diesel. The SAIDS decisions (PDFs below) reveal that both athletes were taking a variety of supplements. Gilbert listed DripDrop, PeptoPro, Enduren and Panado on the Doping Control Form (DCF), but – crucially – not Biogen's Testoforte. Pena listed GH Freak and Test Freak produced by Pharma Freak, Libido & Performance Enhancer for Men produced by SOLAL Healthy Aging [sic.] Specialists, and Testoforte for Stamina produced by Biogen.

This perhaps explains the differences in sanctions. Pena listed Biogen Testoforte on his DCF and sought the advice of a sports nutritionist. Gilbert didn't list Testoforte, and took it on the advice of a friend. However, Pena is a professional athlete and can be expected to exercise caution, whereas Gilbert is an amateur who argues that he competes to stay healthy.

Gilbert's argument that he did not declare Testoforte because his sample was taken after a *'very gruelling'* stage of the Sani2c three day mountain bike event where he was exhausted

and in pain due to a wrist injury. *'The Panel is satisfied that the Athlete has adequately explained the apparent omission on his doping control form'*, reads the ruling.

<http://www.sportsintegrityinitiative.com/wada-overkill-gordon-gilbert-case/>

SPORTS INTEGRITY INITIATIVE

16/03/2018

THE TROUBLE WITH OSTARINE: JIMMY WALLHEAD'S STORY



I'm happy to announce that the product I used in my last camp is the reason for my failed USADA drug test. I sent USADA a fresh sealed tub of the product I used and it was positive for Ostarine, then USADA sourced their own and that was also contaminated & positive for Ostarine to. The fact that I have been proven innocent means so much to me. I have been given a short ban as I should of researched the company and maybe used a bigger more mainstream company. I will be available to fight from July 2018! I want to thank a couple of people who's support and help has been amazing through this hard process, firstly Jeff Novitzky from the UFC and Onye Ikwuakor from USADA. They both have been very supportive. I'm well happy to clear my name and look forward to competing again in the UFC later in 2018!! Thank you to everyone who has stood by me and supported me through this hard time.

[Andy Brown @journAndy andy.brown@the-sii.com](#)

Unless you are a chemist or an anti-doping official, the chances are that you won't have heard of ostarine. Neither had Jimmy Wallhead, a Ultimate Fighting Championship (UFC) fighter based in Loughborough, UK. Yet he was [sanctioned](#) with a nine month ban after a supplement he had used was found to contain the substance.

Ostarine is classed as an anabolic agent by the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA), which reported a low 28 adverse analytical findings (AAFs) across sport in its 2016 Testing Figures [Report](#) (compared to 294 for stanozolol, for example). It is a Selective Androgen Receptor Modulator (SARM) developed as Enobosarm by pharmaceutical company GTX to treat conditions involving muscle wastage or osteoporosis. As such, it is designed to target the androgen receptors in the body, so that selected tissues respond as they would to testosterone, without the side effects.

The key point to note is that Enobosarm, or ostarine, was developed by GTX as an investigational drug, and has not been approved for use in any country. So why are so many athletes testing positive for it?

'In recent years, WADA has reported an increasing number of positive tests involving SARMs, and athletes who use these substances most likely obtain them through black market

channels’, reads [athlete advice](#) from the US Anti-Doping Agency (USADA) issued in July last year. *‘There are in fact products that contain ostarine, but only illegal ones. Given that ostarine is not approved for human use or consumption in the U.S., or in any other country, there are no legal medications that contain ostarine.’*

However, recently, USADA has changed its tune. It appears that there is evidence that ostarine is increasingly turning up in supplements. There are currently 60 products on USADA’s [High Risk List](#) (supplement411) that contain ostarine. In July last year, there were just 36.

*‘The unfortunate reality is that some dietary supplement manufacturers illegally put ostarine and other SARMs in their products, and some **omit ostarine from the label entirely** or use misleading names to confuse consumers’, [writes](#) UFC/USADA. ‘You should look out for ostarine’s many synonyms, including MK-2866, enobasarm, (2S)-3-(4-cyanophenoxy)-N-[4-cyano-3-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl]-2-hydroxy-2-methylpropanamide, and GTx-024 on supplement labels’.*

There is no doubt that USADA intends this advice to help athletes. However, the Prohibited List contains hundreds of substances, as well as phrasing that it could be argued is confusing. It includes the prohibition of *‘other substances with a similar chemical structure’*, as well as categories of prohibited substances, metabolites of substances and isomers (substances with a similar atomic structure).

Even if you check the Prohibited List, you can still test positive. Checking that the ingredients in a supplement do not feature on the Prohibited List is no guarantee that you will not return an AAF. For example, the List prohibits all Beta-2 agonists without naming them. This does not help an athlete when checking supplement ingredients, unless they happen to know the names of all Beta-2 agonists. It is likely that something like this is what happened to Wallhead.

So are manufacturers putting ostarine into supplements? On *YouTube*, it is hard to separate the snake oil salesmen from genuine user reviews, but the general consensus appears to be that ostarine is effective for people seeking to build muscle and bone strength. This would appear to fit with the medical conditions ostarine was developed to treat in the first place. It also fits with what UFC fighters would be looking for in a supplement.

Jimmy’s story



Wallhead is a UFC fighter, so is regulated by USADA, despite being based in the UK...

Unfortunately, none of this helps Jimmy Wallhead, who was blindsided through use of a supplement that didn't list ostarine as an ingredient on the label. Wallhead has been signed to the UFC, which is not a signatory to the World Anti-Doping Code, for about 18 months. USADA agreed to run the UFC's anti-doping programme on 1 July 2015, an agreement that was [commended](#) by WADA.

"I've been drug tested eight times and never had an issue", he explains. "Passed every single test. All hunky dory. I had a test, then about three or four weeks later got an email saying that I had failed the test due to ostarine. I had no idea what ostarine was at that moment. I googled it and did my research, and then sat down and thought about things.

"I had only changed two products in my training previous to that test. I changed by BCAA amino acids, which I bought from a shop in Loughborough. I checked the ingredients, which were normal. I also bought a protein pancake mix, which I have on a very rare occasion as a breakfast option.

"I thought that it must be to do with one of them, as there was no other thing that I had taken. USADA spoke to me, were very supportive and stood by me. USADA then offered to test the two products for ostarine, and I was very optimistic and thought that the whole thing would be done and dusted very soon."

However, things were not to be as simple as Jimmy first thought. *"A couple of UFC fighters, who are 12 months into their two year bans for ostarine, messaged me", he explains. "One is quite a famous fighter, and he swore on his kids life that he hadn't taken ostarine. He's got two kids and is well paid. He sent 20 products in to be tested and every single one came back negative for ostarine. Straight away, I think – oh shit. I am thinking that even if it was that product or a contaminated supplement, or a contaminated batch, then the odds are low of it coming back positive.*

"I sent the supplements off and didn't hear anything for a long while, and then USADA rang me a fortnight ago and said that the fresh, sealed products I had sent had tested positive for ostarine. USADA said that they would compare the ostarine ratio in the products to the ostarine ratio from my tests.

"They rang me back and said that the ostarine ratio matches the results of my test. Also, during this period, USADA sourced its own tub, and that came back positive for ostarine as well. To cut a long story short, this company have obviously put it in on purpose. In one sense, I'm lucky, because that's clearly the reason that the two tubs have come back positive, in my opinion."

Lucky

It would appear that Jimmy has been lucky that USADA was prepared to go the extra mile, and source its own tub in order to support his assertion that the supplement concerned contained ostarine. Not all anti-doping organisations have taken the same approach. British weightlifter Sonny Webster, who competed at the Rio 2016 Olympics, was [sanctioned](#) with a four year ban by UK Anti-Doping (UKAD) in December last year.

'I was offered on two occasions to admit to knowingly taking ostarine in exchange for a 50% ban reduction', said Webster in a [statement](#). 'You may think that that was a stupid offer not to take, but I was never going to admit to something that I had not done intentionally regardless of the consequences. I was prepared to do everything in my power to prove the truth.'

Webster says that he spent his life savings attempting to discover the source of the ostarine, which he argues could have been due to contaminated supplements or salt tablets. *'The UKAD analyst testified that the amount of ostarine found in my body was the lowest that has ever been reported (4 nanograms/ml) which would make it near impossible to establish the source',* reads his statement.

The Sport Resolutions decision in Webster's case confirms that UKAD was unable to offer him a reduction in his ban because, as he was keen to discover the source of the ostarine, he was not prepared to promptly admit an anti-doping rule violation (ADRV). *'The Tribunal noted that Mr Webster had attempted to investigate the issue of contamination by sending samples from six supplements for testing to DNA Legal',* reads the decision (PDF below). *'Reports from DNA Legal dated 30 August 2017 and 28 September 2017 confirmed that none of the samples tested contained ostarine. In evidence before the Tribunal, Professor [David] Cowan [King's College Drug Control Centre] confirmed that the AAF of the A Sample at 4 nanograms / millilitre was a 'relatively small amount.' Further, Professor Cowan gave evidence that ostarine may have been ingested as a contaminant however there was no conclusive evidence to this effect.*

'The Tribunal acknowledged the difficulties faced by Mr Wester in finding a laboratory to conduct sample tests on the supplements resulting in a delay in admission. However, in the circumstances, the Tribunal concluded that the admission was not prompt given that it was made three months after the AAF on the A Sample and two months after the AAF on the B Sample [...] Given the delay in admission, Mr Webster was not eligible for any reduction of the period of ineligibility under ADR [Anti-Doping Rules] Article 10.6.3.'

<http://www.sportsintegrityinitiative.com/trouble-ostarine-jimmy-wallheads-story/>