



TAS / CAS

TRIBUNAL ARBITRAL DU SPORT
COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT
TRIBUNAL ARBITRAL DEL DEPORTE

CAS 2025/A/11213 Alik Khadartsev v. United World Wrestling (UWW)

ARBITRAL AWARD

delivered by the

COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

sitting in the following composition:

Sole Arbitrator: Mr Mario Vigna, Attorney-at-law in Rome, Italy

in the arbitration between

Alik Khadartsev, Russian Federation and Republic of Uzbekistan

Represented by Mr Anton Smirnov, Attorney-at-law, Moscow, Russian Federation

Appellant

and

United World Wrestling, Switzerland

Represented by Mr Jean-Pierre Morand and Mr Christopher Nseka, Attorneys-at-law at Kellerhals Carrard, Lausanne, Switzerland

Respondent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PARTIES	3
II.	FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	3
III.	PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT	4
IV.	SUBMISSIONS OF THE PARTIES	6
	A. The Appellant.....	6
	B. The Respondent.....	9
V.	JURISDICTION.....	11
VI.	ADMISSIBILITY	13
VII.	APPLICABLE LAW	14
VIII.	MERITS	16
	A. Whether the Appellant was entitled to change his sporting nationality notwithstanding the exhaustion of the RWF’s Exit Quota for 2025.....	17
	B. Whether the UWW’s refusal to grant the Athlete’s request to change his sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek was justified	21
IX.	CONCLUSIONS.....	24
X.	COSTS	24

I. PARTIES

1. Mr Alik Khadartsev (“Mr Khadartsev”, the “Athlete” or the “Appellant”) is a professional wrestler, born in Russia and holder of an Uzbek passport since 18 January 2025.
2. United World Wrestling (the “UWW” or the “Respondent”) is an international federation recognised by the International Olympic Committee as the world governing body for wrestling. It has its seat in Switzerland.
3. The Appellant and the Respondent shall collectively be referred to as the “Parties”.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

4. The following is a summary of the relevant facts and allegations derived from the Parties’ written submissions, supporting documentation and pleadings adduced at the hearing. Additional facts and allegations found in the Parties’ written submissions and evidence may be set out, where appropriate, in connection with the legal discussion that follows. While the Sole Arbitrator has carefully reviewed all factual, legal and evidentiary submissions, he refers in this Award only to the submissions and evidence he considers necessary to explain his reasoning.
5. In 2019, Mr Khadartsev competed for the Russian Wrestling Federation (“RWF”) in the World Junior Wrestling Championship. The Parties agree that this was Mr Khadartsev’s last participation in UWW’s international competitions on behalf of the RWF.
6. On 19 September 2024, a new edition of the UWW Change of Nationality Regulations (the “UWW Regulations”) came into force, setting out the detailed procedure for a wrestler’s change of sporting nationality.
7. On 11 November 2024, the UWW issued a circular (the “UWW Circular”) to all national federations, introducing revised rules governing the change of nationality process as set out in the UWW Regulations. The Circular, *inter alia*, stipulated that its provisions enter into force with immediate effect.
8. On 6 December 2024, the Uzbekistan Wrestling Association (“UWA”) sent a letter to the RWF, requesting the latter’s “*permission in the international transfer*” of five Russian wrestlers, including Mr Khadartsev, to participate in wrestling events “*for the Uzbekistan National team*”.
9. On 9 January 2025, Ms Judith Duchoud (“Ms Duchoud”), on behalf of the UWW Licence and Nationality Department, sent an email to the Bulgarian Wrestling Federation (“BWF”) acknowledging receipt of its official request to obtain the change of sporting nationality of Mr Albert Doev (“Mr Doev”) from the RWF. In the email, the UWW requested the BWF to provide the following documents within 19 January 2025 in order to finalise Mr Doev’s file: (i) RWF’s authorisation to the requested change of sporting nationality; (ii) proof of payment of the administrative fee to the UWW (an invoice for the relevant amount was attached to the email); and (iii) proof of payment of the “*compensation fee*” to the RWF (if requested by the RWF). In the same communication,

the UWW pointed out the following: *“As a reminder, any Federation of origin can allow a maximum of 3 males and 3 females changes per year considering all styles and all age group. Several Federations have asked for some changes of nationality of Athletes from Russia, so we cannot assure you that the Russian Federation will grant its authorization for the departure of Albert.”*

10. On 17 January 2025, Mr Khadartsev sent an email to the RWF informing of his intention to change his sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek.
11. On 18 January 2025, Mr Khadartsev acquired the citizenship of the Republic of Uzbekistan through the issuance of an Uzbek passport.
12. On the same day, the UWA submitted an application to the UWW on behalf of Mr Khadartsev, requesting authorisation for the change of his sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek. The aforementioned letter also stated that *“[t]he corresponding documents are attached except of authorization of the Russian Wrestling Federation that is in the process of arrangement”*.
13. On 19 January 2025, the RWF sent a letter to UWW containing its authorisation to Mr Doev’s requested change of sporting nationality from Russian to Bulgarian.
14. On 31 January 2025, Ms Judith Duchoud, on behalf of the UWW Licence and Nationality Department, sent an email to the UWA communicating the rejection of Mr Khadartsev’s request to change his sporting nationality (the “Appealed Decision”).
15. The Appealed Decision states as follows:

“... any Federation of origin can allow a maximum of 3 males and 3 female changes of nationality per year, considering all styles and all age groups. The Russian Federation has now fulfilled its 2025 male quota, and for this reason, Alik’s change is unfortunately no more possible.

Kindly note that the new Federations of the 3 Athletes of Russian origin initiated their change last year, and Russia made its choice without UWW’s intervention. For your future changes, we suggest you contact the Federation(s) concerned well in advance.” (emphasis in original)

16. As a result, the Appellant initiated the present arbitration proceeding.

III. PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

17. On 20 February 2025, the Appellant, pursuant to Articles R47 and R48 of the Code of Sports-related Arbitration (2023 edition) (the “CAS Code”), filed a Statement of Appeal with the Court of Arbitration for Sport (the “CAS”) against the Respondent with respect to the Appealed Decision.

18. On 27 February 2025, in accordance with Article R51 of the CAS Code, the Appellant informed the CAS Court Office that his Statement of Appeal had to be considered as the Appeal Brief.
19. On 7 April 2025, on behalf of the Deputy President of the CAS Appeals Arbitration Division and pursuant to Articles R40.2 and R40.3 of the CAS Code, the CAS Court Office notified the Parties that Mr Mario Vigna, Attorney-at-law in Rome, Italy, had been appointed as Sole Arbitrator to adjudicate the present case.
20. On 28 April 2025, the Respondent filed its Answer in accordance with Article R55 of the CAS Code.
21. On 15 May 2025, the Appellant sent a letter to the CAS Court Office requesting the admission of additional comments and new evidence into the case file. In the same communication, the Appellant indicated his preference: (i) for a hearing to be held via videoconference; and (ii) for the holding of a case management conference to be left to the discretion of the Sole Arbitrator.
22. On 3 June 2025, the Respondent provided its comments on the Appellant's application to admit new evidence, stating that it did not object to such admission into the case file, provided that its own "*submission and supporting evidence are also admitted on file*".
23. On 4 June 2025, the Appellant filed an unsolicited submission in response to the Respondent's comments on his application.
24. On 10 June 2025, on behalf of the Sole Arbitrator, the CAS Court Office advised the Parties in particular as follows:
 - (i) Both the Appellant's submission of 15 May 2025 and the Respondent's submission of 3 June 2025, along with their accompanying exhibits, were admitted to the case file;
 - (ii) The Appellant's unsolicited comments of 4 June 2025 would be disregarded.
25. With reference to (ii), the Sole Arbitrator specifies that said submission had been filed without a deadline being granted for it and against Article R56 of the CAS Code. In any case, the Sole Arbitrator notes that the Appellant later had a chance to submit his arguments at the hearing and, in any case, at the end thereof, he raised no procedural objection.
26. On 15 July 2025, the CAS Court Office issued the Order of Procedure, which was duly signed and returned by the Parties on 15 (Appellant) and 18 (Respondent) July 2025.
27. On 22 July 2025, a hearing was held via video conference. In addition to the Sole Arbitrator and Ms Delphine Deschenaux-Rochat, CAS Counsel, the following persons attended the hearing:
 - (i) For the Appellant:
 - (a) Mr Alik Khadartsev, the Appellant;

- (b) Mr Anton Smirnov, legal counsel;
- (c) Mrs Elena Kobak, interpreter;
- (ii) For the Respondent:
 - (a) Mr Carlos Roy, Secretary General of the Respondent,
 - (b) Mr Jean-Pierre Morand, legal counsel;
 - (c) Mr Christopher Nseka, legal counsel.
- 28. After their closing pleadings and before the end of the hearing, the Parties confirmed their satisfaction with the manner in which the Sole Arbitrator had conducted the hearing and raised no procedural objections.
- 29. On 15 August 2025, the Appellant requested the CAS to communicate the operative part of the award on an expedited basis, in order to register – as part of the UWA – for the 2025 UWW Senior World Championships held in Zagreb, Croatia from 13 September 2025 to 21 September 2025.
- 30. On 18 August 2025, the CAS Court Office invited the Parties “*to clarify, at their earliest convenience, the deadline for the athletes to register for the 2025 UWW Senior World Championships*”.
- 31. On the same day, the Parties set out their respective positions as follows:
 - (i) The Respondent maintained that the deadline to register for the 2025 UWW Senior World Championships expired on 13 August 2025.
 - (ii) The Appellant argued, *inter alia*, that since the events in which Mr Khadartsev was due to compete were scheduled for 14 and 16 September 2025, the applicable registration deadlines expired “*3 days before the start of the competitions, i.e. 11 and 13 September 2025 respectively*”.
- 32. On 19 August 2025, the Parties submitted further unsolicited clarifications in support of their respective positions.
- 33. The Sole Arbitrator notes that the Appellant’s request became moot, as this Award is issued, with grounds, before 11 September 2025.

IV. SUBMISSIONS OF THE PARTIES

- 34. The following summary of the Parties’ respective positions is illustrative and does not necessarily comprise every argument advanced by the Parties. However, the Sole Arbitrator has carefully considered all of the submissions put forward by the Parties, even if there is no explicit reference to those submissions in the following discussion.

A. The Appellant

- 35. The Appellant, in his Statement of Appeal, requested the CAS to rule as follows:

- “1. The Athlete’s application is admissible.*
 - 2. The appeal filed by the Athlete is upheld.*
 - 3. The decision of the UWW passed on 31 January 2025 is annulled and set aside.*
 - 4. To make a new decision on the case, which will allow the Athlete to change his sports nationality from Russian to Uzbek.*
 - 5. If the Athlete’s Appeal is upheld, the costs of the proceedings shall be borne by the UWW.*
 - 6. Any other requests for relief that the Panel deems fit in the facts and circumstances of the present case.”*
36. The Appellant’s submissions, in essence, may be summarised as follows:
- (i) The Athlete met all necessary requirements to obtain a change of his sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek under the UWW Regulations and the UWW Circular:
 - (a) Under the Introduction to the UWW Regulations and the UWW Circular, the applicant must hold a passport of the country whose sporting nationality he wishes to acquire. In this case, the Athlete acquired Uzbek nationality on 18 January 2025.
 - (b) According to Article 4 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations, three years must have passed since the wrestler last represented his federation of origin in competitions under the authority of the UWW. In this case, the Athlete has last represented the RWF in an international UWW competition on 18 August 2019, *i.e.* more than five years before the filing of his application.
 - (c) In compliance with Article 4 para. 6 lit. a) of the UWW Regulations, the applicant needs an attestation by the federation of origin agreeing with the wrestler’s change of nationality. However, under Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations, where a federation of origin opposes a change of sporting nationality, the change shall nonetheless be granted if three years have elapsed since the wrestler’s last participation for that federation. Accordingly, even if the Athlete did not submit the RWF’s authorisation, he meets the three-year requirement to obtain the change of nationality still.
 - (ii) The Athlete and UWA sent the application for the Athlete’s change of nationality in compliance with the UWW Regulations and the UWW Circular:
 - (a) Under the UWW Circular, an application for a change of nationality must be submitted no later than 19 January 2025. The Athlete sent his request to the UWW via the UWA on 17 January 2025 and, on 18 January 2025, the UWA submitted the relevant documents to the UWW.
 - (b) According to Article 11 of the UWW Regulations, the federation intending to acquire the wrestler must notify the wrestler’s federation of origin in writing of its interest prior to the commencement of any negotiations. The UWA informed the RWF of its interest in obtaining the Athlete’s services with its letter of 6 December 2024.

- (iii) The Athlete was entitled to change his sporting nationality notwithstanding the lack of express authorisation from the RWF, which did not need to be requested:
 - (a) The lack of response from the RWF to the UWA must be interpreted as acceptance of the latter's request. In fact, if the RWF intended to oppose said request, it would have done so expressly, considering that, under Article 7 of the UWW Regulations, oppositions have to be sent in writing.
 - (b) Even if the RWF's lack of response were not interpreted as acceptance, the change of nationality still had to be granted due to the three-year rule under Article 7 of the UWW Regulations.
- (iv) The exit quota under Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations does not apply to the Athlete:
 - (a) Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations – which limits any federation of origin to authorising a maximum of three male and three female changes of nationality per year, across all styles and age groups – applies exclusively where the federation of origin grants its consent. In the present case, the RWF did not provide any consent.
 - (b) The Athlete's fulfillment of the criteria set out in Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations entitles him to change his sporting nationality without being subject to the exit quota. For the purpose of said Article, the RWF's consent is irrelevant. In any case, a federation of origin's opposition cannot override the Athlete's statutory right to effect a change in sporting nationality, and any attempt to condition that right on quota availability is unfounded.
 - (c) The Respondent's interpretation of Article 6 of the UWW Regulations – namely, that the exit quotas in Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations must be observed in all cases, irrespective of a wrestler's fulfilment of the criteria under Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations, is incorrect:
 - Neither Article 6 of the UWW Regulations nor the UWW Circular imposes any requirement that a wrestler proceeding under Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations be included in the exit quota under Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations.
 - The Respondent's references to "quotas" in Article 6 of the UWW Regulations clearly and unambiguously refer to the entry quotas described under Article 3 of the UWW Regulations, and not the exit quotas described in Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations. Similarly, the UWW Circular only references the quotas under Article 3 of the UWW Regulations, and not the exit quotas in Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations.
 - In any case, given that Article 6 of the UWW Regulations is ambiguous, it should be interpreted against the UWW, which established and issued the UWW Regulations and the UWW Circular and in favour of the Athlete.
- (v) The Athlete does not currently hold a national licence issued by the RWF, the last being in 2022. Given that a national licence is issued on an annual basis, and that

the Athlete did not hold such a licence for three of the preceding five years, UWW was obliged, pursuant to Article 6.4 of the UWW Regulations, to grant the Athlete the right to compete for the UWA in 2025, without requiring him to undergo the procedure for changing his sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek.

- (vi) The actions of the UWW and its regulations governing change of nationality were inconsistent, selective and arbitrary and unduly favoured Mr Doev's application over Mr Khadartsev's:
 - (a) The UWW stated that the quota for changing sporting nationality allocated to the RWF had already been exhausted, and therefore the Athlete could not be included. However, the change of sporting nationality of Mr Doev from Russian to Bulgarian was approved by the RWF only on 19 January 2025, *i.e.* after the UWA had submitted the Athlete's application to change his sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek.
 - (b) Although the BWF did not submit the complete set of required documents – specifically, the attestation from the RWF consenting to Mr Doev's change of nationality – the UWW nevertheless issued an invoice to the BWF for the administration fee and even offered the option of paying the compensation fee directly to UWW's account. In contrast, in Mr Khadartsev's case, the UWW did not issue any invoice to the UWA and/or propose any alternative payment arrangements, thereby depriving the UWA of the opportunity to fulfil its financial obligations and submit the relevant proof of payment to the UWW.
- (vii) The UWW Regulations (read with the UWW Circular) allow a national federation to arbitrarily determine the list of wrestlers to whom it issues or does not issue the appropriate permission to change sporting nationality. In this respect, the process of changing a wrestler's sporting nationality is closely tied to the payment of a compensation fee from one national federation to another. As a result, the decision by the federation of origin to approve such a change is often influenced primarily by financial considerations – specifically the amount of compensation offered – rather than the wrestler's wishes or other objective criteria. This practice creates opportunities for wrestlers with a large pool of resources or interested federations to unduly influence the decision-making process.

B. The Respondent

37. The Respondent, in its Answer, requested the following reliefs:

- “(1) *The appeal filed by Mr. Khadartsev against the decision of United World Wrestling taken 31 January 2025 is rejected.*
- (2) *Any other or further prayers for relief of Mr. Khadartsev is rejected.*
- (3) *Mr. Khadartsev shall bear the costs of the present arbitration procedure.*
- (4) *Mr. Khadartsev is ordered to pay a contribution to the legal expenses incurred by UWW in connection with these proceedings.”*

38. The Respondent's submissions, in essence, may be summarised as follows:

- (i) The requirements for any wrestler to change his sporting nationality comprise personal and objective criteria that must apply cumulatively:
 - (a) Personal criteria, related to the applicant:
 - Pursuant to Article 4 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations, a wrestler may change his sporting nationality if (1) he provides copies of both his original and new passports (corresponding to the nationality being waived and the one being acquired, respectively) and (2) obtains the consent of both federations concerned.
 - Under Article 7 of the UWW Regulations, there is no need to obtain the consent of the releasing federation if the wrestler has not participated in any international competitions in the three years preceding the application, and the change may proceed notwithstanding its opposition.
 - (b) Objective criterion – the quota system, restricting the number of transfers between national federations:
 - Entry quota: only one wrestler may enter an accepting federation within the same year, per Article 3 of the UWW Regulations.
 - Exit quota: a maximum of three wrestlers may leave a given federation under Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations.
- (ii) The quota system applies without exemptions, except where expressly provided under the applicable rules:
 - (a) Article 6 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations provides specific requirements for a wrestler to represent a different nationality than the one for which he held a national licence, namely (1) having long-term residence in the receiving country or (2) having acquired the new nationality at birth or before the age of ten. Article 6 para. 3 of the UWW Regulations specifies that, in case said requirements are met, said scenario “*shall not be considered in the quota of nationality changes*”.
 - (b) Unlike Article 6 of the UWW Regulations, nothing under Article 7 of the UWW Regulations suggests that the rule therein shall apply irrespective of the exhaustion of the applicable quotas.
- (iii) Mr Khadartsev was subject to the exhaustion of the RWF's male exit quota for 2025:
 - (a) The three-year rule set out in Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations operates exclusively in circumstances where the consent of the releasing federation is not obtained. In essence, this provision seeks to override the lack of agreement or express opposition from the releasing federation.
 - (b) If the Appellant's interpretation of Article 7 of the UWW Regulations were accepted, it would undermine the purpose and effectiveness of the quota system. This would allow changes of sporting nationality by all such applicants – often not closely connected to the new federation – simply by

withholding consent, contradicting the UWW Regulations’ intent. Such a loophole would invite manipulation and undermine the quota system, which, as Articles 3 and 8 of the UWW Regulations make clear, is designed to prevent abuse by restricting changes made solely for convenience rather than for legitimate and overriding personal interests.

- (c) Mr Khadartsev did not provide evidence that he met the requirements of Article 6 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations, especially considering that he still holds a RWF licence, he did not acquire the Uzbek nationality before the age of 10 and is not a resident of the Republic of Uzbekistan.
- (iv) The UWW did not favour Mr Doev or the other athletes over Mr Khadartsev:
 - (a) The date of filing of the application does not constitute a criterion for determining priority in access to the quota.
 - (b) In any case, Mr Khadartsev’s application was received after three other applications submitted by Russian wrestlers:
 - 18 November 2024 (Athlete ‘T’);
 - 19 November 2024 (Athlete ‘K’);
 - 9 January 2025 (Mr Doev); and
 - 18 January 2025 (Mr Khadartsev).
 - (c) As of the 19 January 2025 deadline, the UWW accepted the first three applications that were both received and complete.

V. JURISDICTION

39. Article R47(1) of the CAS Code reads as follows:

“An appeal against the decision of a federation, association or sports-related body may be filed with CAS if the statutes or regulations of the said body so provide or if the parties have concluded a specific arbitration agreement and if the Appellant has exhausted the legal remedies available to it prior to the appeal, in accordance with the statutes or regulations of that body.”

40. The Appellant argues that the CAS has jurisdiction to hear this case based on the following reasoning:

- (i) The UWW Regulations do not apply to this matter:
 - (a) Per the Introduction, the UWW Bureau is competent to resolve “[a]ll matters relating to the determination of the country which a wrestler may represent in a UWW sanctioned event”.
 - (b) Article 10 of the UWW Regulations does not apply to the present case, as it deals with disputes “between the applicant wrestler and a national federation regarding a change of nationality or between two federations regarding a change of nationality” and, in the present case, the dispute is between the Athlete and the UWW.

- (c) Article 12 of the UWW Regulations deals with appeals filed “*in accordance with the complaint procedure described in the Disciplinary Procedure and Dispute Resolution Regulations*” against decisions of “*the Secretary General*”.
 - (ii) Considering Article 12 of the UWW Regulations and by way of analogy, reference can be made to Title V of the UWW Disciplinary Procedure and Dispute Resolution Regulation, providing in particular the following:

“To the extent appealable, decisions (if applicable complaint decisions) issued in application of the above provisions may be submitted exclusively to the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne, Switzerland, which will resolve the dispute definitively in accordance with the Code of sports-related arbitration.

The time limit for appeal is twenty-one days from the notification of the concerned decision (motivated decision).”
 - (iii) Under Article 6.1 lit. b) of the UWW Constitution, “*the National Federation shall adhere to the Federation Articles of Association and regulations and recognize the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne as the only external judicial instance*”.
41. The Appellant also points out that he had forwarded a request to the UWW in order to clarify the procedural rules to appeal against the Appealed Decision; the UWW stated that it would provide an answer, but never actually replied.
42. The Sole Arbitrator notes that, in the present case, the Appealed Decision stating the UWW’s express refusal to grant the Athlete’s request to change his sporting nationality was issued by Ms Duchoud on behalf of the UWW’s Licence and Nationality Department (see *supra* para. 14).
43. Accordingly, the Appealed Decision:
- (i) Did not fall within the scope of Article 10 of the UWW Regulations;
 - (ii) Was not issued by the UWW Secretary General, thereby excluding the application of Article 12 of the UWW Regulations.
44. That said, the Sole Arbitrator also observes that the decision was not issued by the UWW Bureau, even though, under Article 17 of the UWW Regulations (labelled “*Other Disputes*”) “[a]ll situations not provided in the present rules may be settled definitively by the UWW Bureau”.
45. However, the Sole Arbitrator is of the view that the involvement of the UWW Bureau was correctly excluded. Indeed, the decision of the UWW Licence and Nationality Department represents the final position of UWW on an application for a change of sporting nationality. Article 17 of the UWW Regulations, referring to “*disputes*”, is intended to confer residual competence on the UWW Bureau to address situations not otherwise provided for in the rules; it does not establish, nor can it be interpreted as establishing, any internal right of appeal or review of departmental decisions. Accordingly, Article 17 of the UWW Regulations cannot be construed as creating a further remedy to be exhausted before an appeal may be filed with CAS.

46. Accordingly, the Sole Arbitrator finds that the UWW Regulations do not provide any specific appeal procedure against decisions of the UWW Licence and Nationality Department concerning an application for change of sporting nationality, nor do they indicate whether such decisions are subject to any internal appeal or review mechanism.
47. In view of the foregoing, the Appealed Decision is final within the UWW structure, and the only recourse available to a party is to file an appeal before the CAS, as stipulated in Title V of the Disciplinary Procedure and Dispute Resolution Regulations.
48. The Respondent did not dispute the jurisdiction of the CAS (which also suggests that it accepted the Appellant's line of reasoning) and has also confirmed it by signing the Order of Procedure.
49. Therefore, the CAS has jurisdiction to decide the present dispute.

VI. ADMISSIBILITY

50. Article R49 of the CAS Code reads, *inter alia*, as follows:

“In the absence of a time limit set in the statutes or regulations of the federation, association or sports-related body concerned, or in a previous agreement, the time limit for appeal shall be twenty-one days from the receipt of the decision appealed against. The Division President shall not initiate a procedure if the statement of appeal is, on its face, late and shall so notify the person who filed the document.”

51. In the present case, the applicable time limit is expressly determined by Title V of the UWW Disciplinary Procedure and Dispute Resolution Regulations, which provides that any appealable decision must be challenged within twenty-one days from its notification. This specific provision coincides with the general rule set out in Article R49 of the CAS Code and constitutes the controlling basis for assessing the timeliness of the present appeal.
52. In this context, the Sole Arbitrator notes that the Appealed Decision was notified to the Appellant on 31 January 2025 (see *supra* para. 14). Accordingly, the Statement of Appeal, filed on 20 February 2025 (see *supra* para. 17), was submitted within the 21-day time limit prescribed by Article R49 of the CAS Code.
53. Moreover, the Appeal complied with the procedural requirements of Articles R48, R49 and R51 of the CAS Code.
54. The Respondent does not dispute the admissibility of this appeal.
55. It follows that the appeal is admissible.

VII. APPLICABLE LAW

56. Article R58 of the CAS Code reads as follows:

“The Panel shall decide the dispute according to the applicable regulations and, subsidiarily, to the rules of law chosen by the parties or, in the absence of such a choice, according to the law of the country in which the federation, association or sports-related body which has issued the challenged decision is domiciled or according to the rules of law that the Panel deems appropriate. In the latter case, the Panel shall give reasons for its decision”.

57. In the present case, the “applicable regulations” are undoubtedly the applicable rules and regulations of the UWW, in particular, the UWW Regulations and the UWW Circular.

58. In this respect, the Sole Arbitrator notes that the provisions relevant to this case are the following:

(i) The UWW Regulations:

(a) Article 3 – “*Limitation of the number of nationality changes*” (hereinafter the “Entry Quota”)

“In order to prevent any abuse, a country may receive only one foreign wrestler who applies for a change of nationality per gender per year across all age categories.”

(b) Article 4, paras. 5 and 6 – “*Procedure to obtain a new nationality*”

“5. A wrestler who wishes to change his nationality shall send a request in writing, through his national federation, to UWW in the period between the 1st of October to the 20th of December. No change of nationality will be granted by United World Wrestling outside this period. [...]

6. The applicant’s Federation shall provide the following documents (together with an official translation in French or English):

a) Official attestation by the left federation (signed by its president, on a letter with an official header and seal) agreeing with the applicant’s change of nationality.

b) Official attestation by the host federation (signed by its president, on a letter with an official header and seal) agreeing with the applicant’s change of nationality.

c) Copy of the wrestler’s original passport (corresponding to the nationality waived by the wrestler).

d) Copy of the wrestler’s new passport for which he/she applies for the nationality.

e) Proof of payment to UWW of the fee for the change of nationality set accordingly with Article 5 of these rules.”

(c) Article 6 – “Dual nationality” (and footnote thereto)

“Any wrestler with dual nationality may obtain the international license for only one nationality.

If the wrestler chooses to represent a different nationality from the one he held a national license² for a minimum of three (3) years of the past five (5), he must present a valid and recognised proof of residence of the country which nationality he chose to represent, or proof that he had such nationality at birth or before ten (10) years of age.

In case the wrestler is not able to produce these proofs, it shall be considered as a change of nationality and the present rules shall be applied strictly. If such proofs are produced, it shall not be considered in the quota of nationality changes, however the federation of origin is entitled to a training compensation according to the scale above.

If the wrestler never held a national license for minimum of three (3) years of the past five (5), it shall not be considered as a change of nationality and thus, shall have no effect on the quotas described under Article 3, on the possibility for a future change of nationality or on any other prescription provided in these rules. UWW shall validate the license as soon as the above proofs are produced. [...]

[Footnote n. 2]: *“Or any official equivalent system. In case a National Federation does not have a licensing system, the participation by the athlete in three competitions sanctioned by another NF in the past 5 years shall be considered as equivalent.”*

(d) Article 7, para. 2 – “Expiry of the contract with the former federation” (hereinafter also the “Three-Year Rule”)

“In case the federation of origin is opposed for any reason to a wrestler’s or referee’s change of sports nationality (to be confirmed in writing), the change will still be granted, if or until after a period of three (3) years since the last participation in any international competition as defined in Article 2 (excluding international tournaments) has elapsed. In such case, the training compensation fee and the fee to UWW will be due.”

(e) Article 8, para. 6 – “Participation in competition” (hereinafter also the “Exit Quota”)

“6. In order to prevent any abuse, any federation of origin can only allow a maximum of three (3) males and three (3) female changes of nationality, per year, considering all styles and all age groups.”

(ii) UWW Circular – “Change of nationality – New rules adopted” (boldface and underline parts as in the original):

“The main principles are the following:

- ***A valid (new) passport** is mandatory to be eligible for a change of nationality. All licenses will be delivered only the basis of a valid passport. Residence permits will no longer be accepted.*

- **1 change of nationality per gender** are allowed per year per National Federation (1 man, 1 woman) across all age categories [...]
- **3 years** must have passed since the last representation of the former country in Continental or World Championships, Ranking Series, Cups, as well as Olympic, Continental or Regional Games.
- **Period of Administration:** all applications processed between 1 October and 20 December. [...] For 2025, applications will exceptionally be accepted until 19 January 2025.
[...]
- **Releasing federations:** NFs of origin can grant authorisation of maximum 3 athletes per gender per year, across all styles and age.

These new rules are in force and apply immediately.”

59. Furthermore, in their respective submissions, the Parties have indicated that Swiss law should apply on a subsidiary basis.
60. Considering the above and the fact that the UWW is headquartered in Switzerland, the Sole Arbitrator holds that Swiss law shall apply subsidiarily.
61. Therefore, the Sole Arbitrator concludes that he must apply the applicable rules and regulations of the UWW (in particular, the UWW Regulations and the UWW Circular), with Swiss law applying “subsidiarily”.

VIII. MERITS

62. The Appellant requests that the Appealed Decision be overturned, to the effect that he may be granted a change of his sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek.
63. The Respondent argues that the Appealed Decision correctly rejected the Appellant’s application and must be upheld.
64. The Sole Arbitrator preliminarily notes that the Parties agree as to the following circumstances:
 - (i) Mr Khadartsev’s request needed to comply with the requirements under Article 4 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations (see *supra* at para. 58(i));
 - (ii) In this case, the UWA had not exhausted its Entry Quota for 2025 and could theoretically have accepted the change of sporting nationality of Mr Khadartsev;
 - (iii) Notwithstanding (i), Mr Khadartsev did not need the “*Official attestation by the left federation*”, i.e. the RWF, as he met the Three-Year Rule;
 - (iv) Mr Khadartsev’s application was rejected due to the exhaustion of the RWF’s Exit Quota for 2025. Notably, the UWW received and processed the applications of three Russian wrestlers, namely Athlete ‘T.’, Athlete ‘K.’ and Mr Doev.

65. However, the Parties fundamentally disagree over the interaction, if any, between the Three-Year Rule and the Exit Quota.
66. In fact, the Appellant argues that the Exit Quota does not apply in cases where an athlete is subject to the Three-Year Rule and, therefore, his application could be accepted regardless of the RWF's exhaustion of the Exit Quota. By contrast, the Respondent contends that the Exit Quota has to be respected in all cases (including where the Three-Year Rule applies).
67. In addition, the Appellant argues that, even if the Exit Quota applied to his application, the UWW's rejection would have to be considered arbitrary and unjustified.
68. Based on the submissions of the Parties, the main issues that need to be determined by the Sole Arbitrator are as follows:
- (i) Whether the Appellant was entitled to obtain a change of his sporting nationality notwithstanding the exhaustion of the RWF's Exit Quota for 2025;
 - (ii) Whether the UWW's refusal to grant the Appellant's request to change his sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek was unjustified.
- A. Whether the Appellant was entitled to change his sporting nationality notwithstanding the exhaustion of the RWF's Exit Quota for 2025**
69. Both Parties acknowledge that the RWF had exhausted its Exit Quota for 2025 pursuant to Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations, and that it was the reason leading to the Appealed Decision.
70. However, the Appellant argues that the UWW erred in rejecting his application, as the Exit Quota did not apply to him.
71. Notably, in the Appellant's view, the fact that he met the Three-Year Rule under Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations meant that he could obtain a change of nationality regardless of the Exit Quota.
72. Conversely, the Respondent contends that the Exit Quota applies irrespective of the Three-Year Rule. In particular, the UWW argues that the only express exception to the Exit Quota is contained in Article 6 of the UWW Regulations, but said exception is not met by the Appellant.
73. In light of the Parties' respective arguments, the Sole Arbitrator must analyse and interpret the aforementioned provisions in order to determine whether the Three-Year Rule under Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations can be applied notwithstanding the exhaustion of the Exit Quota by the relevant releasing federation, as set out in Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations.
74. As a starting point, the Sole Arbitrator recalls that under Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations, the Exit Quota applies as follows: *"In order to prevent any abuse, any federation of origin can only allow a maximum of three (3) males and three (3) female changes of nationality, per year, considering all styles and all age groups"*.

75. In addition, under Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations *“In case the federation of origin is opposed for any reason to a wrestler’s or referee’s change of sports nationality (to be confirmed in writing), the change will still be granted, if or until after a period of three (3) years since the last participation in any international competition as defined in Article 2 (excluding international tournaments) has elapsed. In such case, the training compensation fee and the fee to UWW will be due.”*
76. The Sole Arbitrator must determine whether Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations operates as an exception with Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations, such that a change of nationality *“will still be granted”* under Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations, even if the Exit Quota has been exhausted.
77. In order to clarify this issue, the Sole Arbitrator refers to the generally recognised principles of interpretation, pursuant to which the statutes and regulations of international sports federations are to be interpreted according to the principles applicable to the interpretation of law rather than of contracts, as follows:
- “The interpretation of the statutes and rules of a sport association has to be rather objective and always to start with the wording of the rule, which falls to be interpreted. The adjudicating body will have to consider the meaning of the rule, looking at the language used, and the appropriate grammar and syntax. In its search, the adjudicating body will have further to identify the intentions (objectively construed) of the association which drafted the rule, and such body may also take account of any relevant historical background which illuminates its derivation, as well as the entirely regulatory context in which the particular rule is located”* (CAS 2010/A/2071 at para. 20; see also CAS 2020/A/7008-7009).
78. In keeping with the above, the Sole Arbitrator is of the view that Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations does not constitute an exception to the Exit Quota provided under Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations.
79. First, the Sole Arbitrator notes that, per the plain wording of Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations, a change of nationality will *“still”* be granted if the following conditions are met:
- (i) The federation of origin *“is opposed for any reason to a wrestler’s or referee’s change of sports nationality (to be confirmed in writing)”*;
 - (ii) *“(3) years since the last participation in any international competition...has elapsed”*.
80. While the use of the word *“still”* suggests that this provision will be applied irrespective of (and thus as an exception to) a rule that would otherwise apply in normal circumstances, the Sole Arbitrator finds that nothing in Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations suggests its relationship with (and application despite) the Exit Quota.
81. In fact, the Sole Arbitrator recalls that as a rule, Article 4 para. 6 lit. a) of the UWW Regulations (see *supra* at para. 58) requires, for a change of sporting nationality to be granted, the submission of a document showing the consent of the releasing federation.

82. Therefore, it is reasonable to interpret Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations as providing a way to “*still*” obtain a change of nationality when the aforementioned consent is missing, without any impact on the application of the Exit Quota. Notably, Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations is properly read as allowing the applicant to avoid providing the consent of the federation of origin among the documents filed under Article 4 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations, thereby fulfilling all the “personal” requirements under the UWW Regulations, but still being potentially subject to the “objective” requirement of the Exit Quota.
83. Nor does the wording of Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations allow one to reach a different conclusion. In this respect, the Appellant stressed that Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations provides a limit so that “*any federation of origin can only allow*” three changes of nationality per year. Accordingly, in his view, the Exit Quota solely applies to situations expressly authorised by the federation of origin, while Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations is a clear exception thereto as it refers to cases in which “*the federation of origin is opposed*” to said change.
84. The Sole Arbitrator does not concur with this interpretation, as it would completely undermine the effectiveness of Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations and its intent to “*prevent any abuse*”.
85. In fact, if that were the case, the quota system would easily be subject to potential circumvention by national federations. In particular, any federation interested in obtaining training compensation fees from more than three host federations (*i.e.* the limit under the Exit Quota) would be entitled to simply reject an application by a wrestler meeting the requirement *sub* (ii), even without any subjective motivation leading to said rejection, for the sole purpose of obtaining a further fee. This would clearly frustrate the application of the Exit Quota as well as the UWW’s intent, as per the UWW Circular, to prevent national federations from potentially overusing the rules to their advantage.
86. Moreover, any interaction between the “personal” rule under Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations and the “objective” rule under Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations would open the door to circumvention of the rules.
87. Notably, for instance, one national federation could formally “*oppose*” in writing a wrestler’s change of nationality due to the exhaustion of its relevant Exit Quota and trigger the application, for any athlete meeting the requirement *sub* (ii) above, of the exception under Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations. Such an outcome is clearly unreasonable, considering that (a) the “opposition” under Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations would need to be based on “subjective” rather than “objective” motives for exclusion and (b) once again, it would be too easy for the federation of origin to circumvent the rules and obtain further changes of sporting nationality (and thus more training compensation fees).
88. In addition, the Sole Arbitrator notes that, despite both Parties’ agreement as to the applicability of the Three-Year Rule to this case, in the present matter the RWF did not expressly “*oppose*” the Athlete’s change of nationality within the meaning of Article 7

para. 2 of the UWW Regulations, considering that the latter requires an opposition “*to be confirmed in writing*” and the RWF never formally replied to the UWA’s request.

89. That said, regardless of the RWF’s reasons for its (lack of) reply in this case, which are outside the scope of the Sole Arbitrator’s determination, the Sole Arbitrator concludes that Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations and Article 8 para. 6 of the UWW Regulations must be interpreted to mean that the former provides an exception to a “personal” requirement, while the latter is an “objective” requirement on which Article 7 para. 2 of the Regulations does not have any bearing.
90. The aforementioned interpretation is also corroborated by the fact that, as underlined by the Respondent, the UWW Regulations expressly stipulate elsewhere the exceptions to the application of the “objective” requirement of the Exit Quota, and even of the Entry Quota.
91. Notably, the Sole Arbitrator recalls that Article 6 of the UWW Regulations expressly sets out the circumstances in which a change of sporting nationality is permitted, irrespective of the quotas:
 - (i) Article 6 para. 3 of the UWW Regulations specifies that, if an athlete proves to meet the requirements of Article 6 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations “*it shall not be considered in the quota of nationality changes*” while, on the contrary “[i]n case the wrestler is not able to produce these proofs, it shall be considered as a change of nationality”;
 - (ii) Article 6 para.4 of the UWW Regulations refers to the specific scenario of a wrestler that “*never held a national license for minimum of three (3) years of the past five (5)*” which “*shall not be considered as a change of nationality and thus, shall have no effect on the quotas described under article 3, on the possibility for a future change of nationality or on any other prescription provided in these rules*”.
92. Therefore, the Sole Arbitrator is of the view that the “objective” requirement of the Exit Quota can be derogated only where an express exception is provided under the UWW Regulations.
93. In light of the above, considering the wording of the provisions of the UWW Regulations as well as their systematic interpretation, the Sole Arbitrator concludes that Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations does not constitute an exception to the Exit Quota – or even the Entry Quota, which in any event is not relevant for the present case.
94. Accordingly, as the RWF had exhausted its Exit Quota for 2025, Mr Khadartsev’s request had to be rejected, regardless of the fact that he met the Three-Year Rule under Article 7 para. 2 of the UWW Regulations.
95. For the sake of completeness, the Sole Arbitrator observes that the Appellant made only a passing reference to Article 6 of the UWW Regulations, noting that he last held a national licence from the RWF in 2022. However, he did not formally rely on Article 6 para. 2 or Article 6 para. 4 of the UWW Regulations as a ground for his request.

96. In any event, the Sole Arbitrator finds that the Appellant's circumstances do not fall within the scope of the exceptions provided under Article 6 of the UWW Regulations. Those provisions are drafted as narrowly circumscribed derogations from the quota system and must be expressly invoked and substantiated. No evidence was produced by the Appellant to demonstrate that he could meet the requirements of Article 6 para. 2, and his situation does not correspond to the scenario envisaged in Article 6 para. 4.
97. Accordingly, the Sole Arbitrator concludes that Article 6 of the UWW Regulations has no bearing on the present case and cannot displace the application of the Exit Quota, which remains the decisive obstacle to the Appellant's request.
- B. Whether the UWW's refusal to grant the Athlete's request to change his sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek was justified**
98. Having concluded that the Athlete's request to change his sporting nationality was subject to the Exit Quota, the Sole Arbitrator will next examine whether the UWW's refusal of his application was justified.
99. On the one hand, the Appellant argued that the exclusion of his application was arbitrary, as the change of sporting nationality of Mr Doev from Russian to Bulgarian was approved by the RWF only on 19 January 2025, *i.e.* after the UWA had submitted its application to change the Athlete's sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek.
100. Moreover, the Appellant submits that the UWW engaged in inconsistent and selective conduct as, in the case of Mr Doev, the UWW issued the relevant invoices to the BWF despite the application being incomplete, and even offered alternative payment arrangements. By contrast, no such opportunity was afforded to the UWA, and it was thereby unable to demonstrate timely payment of its financial obligations.
101. On the other hand, the Respondent stresses that the UWW did not adopt any inconsistent or selective conduct and, as of the 19 January 2025 deadline, it accepted the first three applications that were both received and complete.
102. In order to assess whether the UWW was justified in refusing the Athlete's application, it is necessary to outline the scope of the UWW's functions in relation to a wrestler's request to change his/her sporting nationality.
103. After a careful review of the UWW Regulations, the UWW Circular and other evidence on file, the Sole Arbitrator considers that, although UWW is the entity responsible for authorising a wrestler's application to change his/her sporting nationality, it does not play a role or exercise discretion in how national federations allocate their quotas or select the athletes to whom an attestation is issued. Such decisions rest exclusively with the relevant national federations.
104. UWW's role is instead confined to reviewing applications submitted by the new federation on behalf of wrestlers and granting authorisation once all relevant documentation has been duly provided. Neither the UWW Regulations nor the UWW Circular prescribe the procedure that the UWW must follow where more than three

applications are submitted by wrestlers of the same nationality during a given year. Accordingly, the denial of the Athlete's request to change his sporting nationality must be assessed against general considerations of fairness, and examined to determine whether UWW's conduct was arbitrary or discriminatory.

105. In this regard, on the basis of the evidence on file, the Sole Arbitrator recalls the relevant timelines and events – undisputed by the Parties – concerning the applications for changing sporting nationality:
- (i) On 18 and 19 November 2024, the UWW received the applications of Russian Athletes 'T.' and 'K.', respectively. The timing of these applications and the UWW's decision to grant these requests are not challenged by the Appellant.
 - (ii) Per the clarification filed by the Respondent on 9 January 2025, a third athlete, 'D.', filed an application to UWW for a further change of sporting nationality from Russia. Considering the evidence on file and that a reply was provided by the UWW to the BWF on the same day (see *supra* at para. 9), the Sole Arbitrator concludes that 'D.' is actually Mr Doev. He was the third Russian wrestler seeking an international transfer, following Athletes 'T' and 'K' (see *supra* para. 9).
 - (iii) On the same day, the UWW informed the BWF that Mr Doev's application was incomplete, as it required: (a) RWF's official attestation consenting to the requested change of sporting nationality; (b) proof of payment of the administrative fee to the UWW; and (c) proof of payment of training compensation to the RWF (if requested by the RWF). To finalise his transfer, the UWW issued an invoice in respect of the applicable administrative fee and asked the BWF to submit the missing documents by 19 January 2025 (see *supra* para. 9).
 - (iv) On 17 January 2025, the Athlete sent an email to the RWF expressing his intention to change his sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek (see *supra* para. 10).
 - (v) On 18 January 2025, the UWA (on behalf of the Athlete) applied to change his sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek, on the same day he obtained Uzbek citizenship (see *supra* paras. 11 and 12).
 - (vi) On 19 January 2025, the UWW received the RWF's attestation consenting to Mr Doev's requested change of sporting nationality. The BWF's application was thus deemed complete within the prescribed deadline, and UWW granted authorisation for Mr Doev's change of sporting nationality (see *supra* para. 13).
106. The Sole Arbitrator took note of the Respondent's position that UWW plays no role and exercises no discretion in determining how national federations utilise their quotas or select the athletes to whom they grant the requisite attestation. Any issue arising from the relevant decisions lies, according to the Respondent, exclusively under the responsibility of the RWF. The Sole Arbitrator agrees that it is therefore not for UWW to explain the reasons why the RWF elected to allocate its third and final quota to Mr Doev rather than to Mr Khadartsev.

107. In light of the foregoing, the Sole Arbitrator finds that the UWW acted fairly and logically, without any selective or inconsistent conduct. In arriving at this conclusion, the Sole Arbitrator also notes the following:
- (i) As of 18 January 2025, both Mr Doev's application (dated 9 January 2025) and the Athlete's application (dated 18 January 2025) were incomplete. Each application lacked: (a) the RWF's attestation consenting to the requested change of sporting nationality; (b) proof of payment of the administrative fee to UWW; and (c) proof of payment of the training compensation to the RWF (if requested by the RWF).
 - (ii) As of 19 January 2025 (*i.e.* the deadline under the UWW Circular for accepting applications), Mr Doev's application was complete. In contrast, the Athlete's application remained incomplete because: (a) the UWA indicated in its application that it was awaiting the RWF's approval, which was never provided (see *supra* para. 12); and (b) UWW had not issued an invoice to the UWA in respect of its administrative fee, meaning no proof of payment was submitted.
108. The Appellant insists that the UWW's conduct on 19 January 2025 was arbitrary and unduly favoured Mr Doev, but the Sole Arbitrator does not concur with this contention.
109. First, as to the lack of the RWF's approval, the RWF's decision not to reply to Mr Khadartsev can only be explained or justified by the RWF, which is not a party to these proceedings. The legitimacy of the RWF's decision, therefore, lies outside the scope of this appeal. Moreover, even assuming that Mr Khadartsev was formally exempt from producing the RWF's attestation by relying on the Three-Year Rule, the UWA's application nonetheless referred to the need for such attestation and made no mention of a possible application of the Three-Year Rule. Accordingly, UWW was entitled to regard Mr Khadartsev's application as incomplete (see *supra* para. 12).
110. Second, given that Mr Doev's application had been submitted earlier and was completed by the 19 January 2025 deadline, it was reasonable for UWW to prioritise that application by following a chronological order based on the date of receipt. By contrast, the Appellant's application remained incomplete and could not be processed further. In this respect, although the UWW Regulations stipulate immediate invoicing, it was reasonable for UWW to refrain from issuing an invoice in respect of an application exceeding the quota.
111. In view of the above circumstances and considerations, the Sole Arbitrator finds that the UWW did not act inconsistently or arbitrarily, and accordingly, its refusal to grant Mr Khadartsev's request to change his sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek was justified.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

112. In view of all the above and having considered all the evidence and submissions of the Parties, the Sole Arbitrator concludes that:

- (i) Mr Khadartsev was not entitled to change his sporting nationality due to the exhaustion of the RWF's male exit quota for 2025.
- (ii) The UWW's refusal to grant Mr Khadartsev's request to change his sporting nationality from Russian to Uzbek was justified.

113. All other or further claims or requests submitted by the Parties are hereby dismissed.

X. COSTS

(...)

ON THESE GROUNDS

The Court of Arbitration for Sport rules that:

1. The Appeal filed on 20 February 2025 by Mr Alik Khadartsev against the decision rendered by United World Wrestling (UWW) on 31 January 2025 is dismissed.
2. The decision issued on 31 January 2025 by United World Wrestling (UWW) is confirmed.
3. (...).
4. (...).
5. All other and further motions or prayers for relief are dismissed.

Seat of arbitration: Lausanne, Switzerland

Date: 11 September 2025

THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

Mario Vigna
Sole Arbitrator