

CAS 2025/A/11555 Ismaily Sports Club v. FIFA & Firas Chaouat

ARBITRAL AWARD

delivered by the

COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

sitting in the following composition:

President: Mr Patrick Grandjean, Attorney-at-law in Belmont, Switzerland
Arbitrators: Dr Rodrigo Arias Grillo, Attorney-at-law in Madrid, Spain
Mr Lars Hilliger, Attorney-at-law in Copenhagen, Denmark

in the arbitration between

Ismaily Sports Club, Ismailia, Egypt

Represented by Mr Ahmed Alian Murad and Mr Mohamed Reda Khader, Attorneys-at-law with CSS Sports Sudan, Port Sudan-City, Sudan

Appellant

and

Fédération Internationale de Football Association, Zurich, Switzerland

Represented by Mr Miguel Liétard Fernández-Palacios, Director of Litigation and Mrs Cristina Pérez González, Senior Legal Counsel at its Litigation Department, Coral Gables, Florida, United States of America

First Respondent

Firas Chaouat, Tunisia

Represented by Mr Ali Abbes and Mr Mohamed Rokbani, Attorneys-at-law with Global Sport Consulting Law and Management Firm, Monastir, Tunisia

Second Respondent

I. PARTIES

1. Ismaily Sports Club is a football club with its registered office in Ismailia, Egypt (the “Club” or the “Appellant”). It is a member of the Egyptian Football Association (“EFA”), itself affiliated with the Fédération Internationale de Football Association.
2. The Fédération Internationale de Football Association (“FIFA”) is an association under Swiss law and has its registered office in Zurich, Switzerland. FIFA is the governing body of international football at worldwide level. It exercises regulatory, supervisory and disciplinary functions over continental confederations, national associations, clubs, officials and players worldwide.
3. Mr Firas Chaouat is a professional football player, born on 8 May 1996 and of Tunisian nationality (the “Player”).
4. FIFA and the Player are jointly referred to as the “Respondents”.
5. The Club and the Respondents are jointly referred to as the “Parties”.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

6. Below is a summary of the relevant facts and allegations based on the Parties’ written submissions and evidence adduced in these proceedings. References to additional facts and allegations found in the Parties’ written submissions and evidence will be made, where relevant, in connection with the legal analysis that follows. While the Panel has considered all the facts, allegations, legal arguments, and evidence submitted by the Parties in the present proceedings, it refers in its Award only to the submissions and evidence it deems necessary to explain its reasoning.
- A. *The proceedings before the FIFA Disciplinary Committee constituting the subject of the present arbitration proceedings***
7. On 1 October 2022, the Player and the Club concluded an employment contract valid as from the 2022/2023 season until the end of the 2024/2025 season (the “Employment Contract”).
8. On 25 June 2023, the Player unilaterally terminated the Employment Contract due to the Club’s failure to pay outstanding salaries.
9. On 18 July 2023, the Player lodged a claim against the Club before the FIFA Dispute Resolution Chamber (“DRC”), requesting to be awarded outstanding remuneration and compensation for breach of contract.
10. On 12 January 2024, the DRC issued the following decision, under reference number FPSD-10961 (the “DRC Decision”):

- “ 1. *The claim of the [Player] is partially accepted.*
2. *The claim of the [Club] is rejected.*

3. *The [Club] must pay to the [Player] the following amounts:*
 - *USD 95,000 as outstanding remuneration plus 5% interest p.a. as from 21 October 2022 until the date of effective payment;*
 - *USD 37,500 as outstanding remuneration plus 5% interest p.a. as from 1 February 2023 until the date of effective payment;*
 - *USD 37,500 as outstanding remuneration plus 5% interest p.a. as from 1 May 2023 until the date of effective payment;*
 - *USD 35,000 as outstanding remuneration plus 5% interest p.a. as from 25 June 2023 until the date of effective payment;*
 - *USD 697,627 as compensation for breach of contract without just cause plus 5% interest p.a. as from 25 June 2023 until the date of effective payment.*
 4. *Any further claims of the [Player] are rejected.*
 5. *[...]*
 6. *The [Club] shall be banned from registering any new players, either nationally or internationally, for the two next entire and consecutive registration periods following the notification of the present decision.*
 7. *If full payment is not made within 30 days of notification of this decision, the present matter shall be submitted, upon request of the [Player], to the FIFA Disciplinary Committee.*
 8. *This decision is rendered without costs.”*
11. On 7 February 2024, the Club filed an appeal against the DRC Decision with the Court of Arbitration for Sport (“CAS”). The dispute was recorded under *CAS 2024/A/10331 Ismaili Sporting Club v. Firas Chaouat & FIFA*.
 12. On 13 September 2024, the Club filed before the CAS an application to stay the execution of the DRC Decision, which was rejected in an order issued on 2 October 2024.
 13. Nevertheless, and later on, the Club exploited a technical error in the FIFA Transfer Matching System (“TMS”) that incorrectly showed the ban imposed in the DRC Decision as lifted and proceeded to sign new players.
 14. On 7 January 2025, the Player’s representative reported to FIFA that the Club had been concluding employment contracts with new players despite the registration ban.
 15. After investigation, FIFA confirmed that a TMS malfunction had caused the issue and corrected the system to show that the ban was still in force, as per the DRC Decision.
 16. On 9 January 2025, the Club sent an email to FIFA expressing its surprise at the imposition of its registration ban on the TMS, arguing that the related proceedings before the CAS were still ongoing and that no final decision or amount had been determined.

17. The same day, FIFA replied to the Club that CAS had not granted any provisional measures and that the registration ban therefore remained fully in full force.
18. On 29 January 2025, the Club filed a further request for provisional measures against FIFA before CAS, under CAS reference *CAS 2025/O/11158 Ismaily SC v. Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA)*, which was dismissed in an order issued on 7 February 2025. These arbitral proceedings were ultimately terminated due to the Club's failure to file the required Request for Arbitration within the prescribed deadline.
19. On 27 March 2025 and in procedure *CAS 2024/A/10331*, the CAS rendered its award partially upholding the Club's appeal against the DRC Decision ("CAS Award"). It ruled as follows:

“[...]

1. *The appeal filed on 7 February 2024 by [the Club] against the decision rendered by the FIFA Dispute Resolution Chamber on 12 January 2024 is partially upheld.*
2. *Point 3 of the operative part of the decision rendered by the FIFA Dispute Resolution Chamber on 12 January 2024 is modified as follows:*

‘The [Club] must pay to the [Player] the following amounts:

- *USD 16,500 as outstanding signing on fee plus 5% interest p.a. as from 2 October 2022 until the date of effective payment;*
- *USD 13,089 as outstanding remuneration plus 5% interest p.a. as from 1 February 2023 until the date of effective payment;*
- *USD 20,625 as outstanding remuneration plus 5% interest p.a. as from 1 May 2023 until the date of effective payment; and*
- *USD 311,093.27 as compensation for breach of contract without just cause plus 5% interest p.a. as from 26 June 2023 until the date of effective payment.’*

3. *The other points of the operative part of the decision rendered by the FIFA Dispute Resolution Chamber on 12 January 2024 are confirmed.*
4. *The costs of these arbitration proceedings, to be determined and served to the Parties by the CAS Court Office, shall be borne in the proportion of 70% (seventy percent) by [the Club] and 30% (thirty percent) by [the Player].*
5. *[The Club] is ordered to pay the amount of CHF 2'000 (two thousand Swiss Francs) to [the Player] towards his legal fees and other expenses incurred in connection with these arbitration proceedings.*
6. *All the other motions or prayers for relief are dismissed.”*

20. It is undisputed that the CAS Award has become final and binding.
21. On 1 April 2025, the Player formally invited the Club to comply with the CAS Award, without any result.

22. On 22 April 2025, the Player filed a complaint before the FIFA Disciplinary Committee pursuant to Article 21 of the FIFA Disciplinary Code of the 2023 edition (“FDC”) following the Club’s failure to comply with the CAS Award. The Player requested the FIFA Disciplinary Committee “*to take an appropriate sanction against the [Club] including an interest of 18% instead of 5% and a deduction of points in the present sportive season.*”
23. In the proceedings before the FIFA Disciplinary Committee, the Club explained that, since August 2023, it had undertaken a complete reform of its management and had made significant efforts to resolve disputes inherited from the previous administration. Despite its best efforts to meet financial obligations, the Club claimed to be facing serious financial difficulties due to Egypt’s ongoing cash-flow crisis and “*a massive decline in revenues and a lack of income source*”. It asserted its commitment to fulfilling its financial obligation towards the Player, noting that it has already complied with more than eight settlement agreements involving both international and local players. Following a Board of Directors’ meeting on 28 January 2025, the Club sought financial assistance from the Ministry of Youth and Sports, which approved a loan request on 19 March 2025. The Club had since obtained financial approval from the National Bank of Egypt and expected to receive the loan by the end of the month, allowing full payment to the Player by no later than 10 June 2025. Accordingly, the Club requested that FIFA refrained from imposing any sanctions before 10 June 2025. It further contended that its non-compliance was not due to bad faith or deliberate delay, but rather to procedural delays in the loan process beyond its control, and therefore no additional sanctions—such as interest at 18% p.a. or a points deduction—should be imposed.
24. In a decision rendered on 9 May 2025, the FIFA Disciplinary Committee emphasized that it lacked authority to “*review and/or change the substance of a previous FIFA or CAS decision which is both final and binding, but that it has as a sole task the role of verifying whether the debtor party has complied with the relevant decision by settling its debt towards the creditor party*”. It noted that the Club acknowledged its debt to the Player but cited ongoing management reforms, financial difficulties, and pending loan arrangements as reasons for non-payment, requesting an extension until 10 June 2025. The FIFA Disciplinary Committee recalled that financial hardship did not exempt a club from its obligations or justify an extension of payment deadlines, which could only be agreed directly with the creditor. Consequently, the FIFA Disciplinary Committee rejected the Club’s request for “*an extension of the time limit to pay the outstanding amount ordered by the CAS*” and found that the Club had failed to comply with the CAS Award, thereby breaching Article 21 FDC.
25. As a result, on 9 May 2025, the FIFA Disciplinary Committee issued the following decision under reference number FDD-23873: “[...]”
 1. *The [Club] is found responsible for failing to comply in full with the FIFA decision rendered on 12 January 2024 (Ref. FPSD-10961) as modified by the decision of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (Ref. CAS 2024/A/10331).*
 2. *The [Club] is ordered to pay to the [Player], as follows:*

- *USD 16,500 as outstanding remuneration plus 5% interest p.a. as from 2 October 2022 until the date of effective payment;*
 - *USD 13,089 as outstanding remuneration plus 5% interest p.a. as from 1 February 2023 until the date of effective payment;*
 - *USD 20,625 as outstanding remuneration plus 5% interest p.a. as from 1 May 2023 until the date of effective payment;*
 - *USD 311,093.27 as compensation for breach of contract without just cause plus 5% interest p.a. as from 26 June 2023 until the date of effective payment.*
3. *The [Club] is granted a final deadline of 30 days as from notification of the present decision in which to pay the amount due. Upon expiry of the aforementioned final deadline and in the event of persistent default or failure to comply in full with the decision within the period stipulated, a ban on registering new players will be issued until the complete amount due is paid.*
 4. *The [Club] is ordered to pay a fine to the amount of CHF 20,000.*
 5. *The fine is to be paid within 30 days of notification of the present decision.”*
26. On 10 June 2025, the Parties were notified of the decision issued by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee (the “Appealed Decision”).
- B. The parallel disciplinary proceedings against the Club for its failure to respect the registration ban**
27. On 9 May 2025, the FIFA Disciplinary Committee rendered another disciplinary decision, under reference number FDD-23891 (hereinafter, the “Ban-related Disciplinary Decision”), deciding as follows: “[...]”
1. *The [Club] is found responsible for failing to comply in full with the FIFA decision rendered on 12 January 2024 (Ref. FPSD-10961) by registering (new) players despite the registration ban imposed on the latter by FIFA.*
 2. *The [Club] shall be banned from registering new players, either nationally or internationally, for two (2) entire and consecutive registration periods following the notification of the present decision.*
 3. *The [Club] is ordered to pay a fine to the amount of CHF 10,000.*
 4. *The fine is to be paid within 30 days of notification of the present decision.”*
28. On 12 June 2025, the Club challenged before the CAS the Ban-related Disciplinary Decision. The matter was registered under CAS 2025/A/11515 *Ismaily Sporting Club v. FIFA*. At the same time, the Club filed an application to stay the execution of the Ban-related Disciplinary Decision, which was subsequently dismissed by an order issued on 11 July 2025.

III. PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

29. On 29 June 2025, the Club lodged its Statement of Appeal with the CAS against the Appealed Decision in accordance with Article R47 *et seq.* of the Code of Sports-related Arbitration (2025 edition) (the “Code”). As part of its relief sought in the Statement of Appeal, the Club requested “*the CAS Panel to: [stay] the execution of the [Appealed Decision] until final judgment.*”
30. On 7 July 2025, the CAS Court Office, *inter alia*, acknowledged receipt of the Club’s Statement of Appeal, took note that the Club had nominated Dr Rodrigo Arias Grillo as Arbitrator and recalled that “*in accordance with Swiss law and CAS jurisprudence, decisions of financial nature issued by a private Swiss association are not enforceable while under appeal. Therefore, the [Club’s] request for the stay of the challenged decision is considered moot.*”
31. On 10 July 2025, the Club filed its Appeal Brief in accordance with Article R51 of the Code.
32. On 11 July 2025, FIFA informed the CAS Court Office that the Respondents had agreed to jointly nominate Mr Lars Hilliger as Arbitrator in these arbitration proceedings.
33. On 24 September 2025, FIFA requested a ten-day extension of the deadline to file its Answer, which was granted in accordance with Article R32(2) of the Code.
34. On 30 September 2025, the Player filed his Answer in accordance with Article R55 of the Code.
35. On 8 October 2025, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that the Panel to hear the case had been constituted as follows: Mr Patrick Grandjean, President of the Panel, Dr Rodrigo Arias Grillo and Mr Lars Hilliger, Arbitrators.
36. On 20 October 2025, FIFA filed its Answer in accordance with Article R55 of the Code.
37. On 21 October and 22 October 2025 respectively, the Player and FIFA expressed the view that a hearing was not necessary, while, on 28 October 2025, the Club confirmed that it preferred a hearing to be held in this matter.
38. On 4 November 2025, the CAS Court Office informed the Parties that the Panel deemed itself sufficiently well informed to issue its decision solely on the basis of the written submissions and provided them with the Order of Procedure.
39. The Order of Procedure was returned to the CAS Court Office, duly signed by the Player on 5 November 2025, by FIFA on 6 November 2025 and by the Club on 8 November 2025. By signing the Order of Procedure, the Parties confirmed their agreement that the Panel may decide the matter based solely on their written submissions and that their right to be heard had been respected.

IV. SUBMISSIONS OF THE PARTIES

A. The Appellant

40. In its Statement of Appeal, the Club submitted the following requests for relief:

“The Club respectfully requests the CAS Panel to:

- 1. Stay the execution of the FIFA Disciplinary Committee decision dated 9 May 2025 (Ref. no. FDD-23873) until final judgment.*
- 2. Admit this appeal as valid in form and substance.*
- 3. Annul or substantially reduce the disciplinary fine of CHF 20,000.*
- 4. Approve a structured payment plan starting immediately upon the disbursement of the Club's bank loan in August 2025.*
- 5. Appoint the arbitrator: Dr. Rodrigo Arias Grillo Spain.”*

41. In its Appeal Brief, the Club submitted the following requests for relief:

“[The Club] respectfully requests from your esteemed tribunal the following:

- 1. To accept the appeal in form for being submitted within the legal deadline and fulfilling all required formal conditions;*
- 2. To accept the appeal in substance, without affecting the essence of the ruling issued in case CAS 2024/A/10331, and in a manner that does not prejudice the player's rights to the financial amounts determined for him;*
- 3. To annul or reduce the additional disciplinary compensation amount imposed at \$311,093.27, for substantiated objective and factual reasons evidenced by documents;*
- 4. To obligate the second party to bear the procedural costs or at least share them in a fair proportion between the two parties, considering the principle of proportionality and the documented mitigating circumstances.”*

42. The submissions of the Club, in essence, may be summarized as follows:

- *“The Club does not challenge the legality of the CAS award but seeks reconsideration of the manner and timeline of its enforcement due to current financial hardship and the failure of negotiations for amicable settlement.”*
- The Club is facing financial hardship, currently preventing full payment. Nevertheless, it had secured a bank loan, which was set to be released by mid-July 2025, and which was expressly earmarked to cover all outstanding international debts, including the Player's claim. However, the process collapsed in its final stages when the Club's first team dropped to last place in the relegation group, *“which posed a significant threat to the club's image and its position as a sports institution within the Premier League”*. As a result, the sponsoring company withdrew its loan guarantee on 28 May 2025.

- In an unexpected way, the Egyptian Professional Clubs Association decided to cancel relegation for the 2024/2025 season *“as part of a comprehensive restructuring of local competition aimed at addressing scheduling imbalances and the congestion of seasons since the COVID-19 pandemic in 2019.”* This decision temporarily spared all teams from relegation. However, the Club had been in last place, and the next 2025/2026 season will be critical, with four teams set to be relegated. Due to the existing registration ban, the Club risks severe sporting and financial consequences if it is unable to strengthen its squad. Maintaining the sanctions would cause irreparable harm to the Club and therefore their immediate suspension is necessary.
- *“After the official confirmation of the cancellation of relegation, [...] the guarantee procedures [in relation with the bank loan resumed]; however, the delay in making the official decision [of the cancellation of relegation] forced the club to start the procedures from scratch, resulting in a delay in sending the first installment of the bank loan, and thus making it impossible to fulfill the financial obligation towards the player on the specified date.”*
- *“It is established and known organizationally and financially that the sponsorship items from the United Company are typically disbursed to the club one week before the season starts or one week after at most. Since the start of the new season 2025/2026 is scheduled for August 16, 2025, the first installment of the loan associated with the sponsorship item can only be disbursed during the period from August 9 to August 23, 2025. [...] Accordingly, the club, even with its full commitment to the partial or complete implementation of FIFA's decision, was not able – realistically and accounting-wise – to commence repayment before July 20 and until August 16, 2025, a period that was not available in the previous executive schedule imposed by the Disciplinary Committee.”*
- The Club cannot be held responsible for delays arising from circumstances beyond its control and amounting to force majeure.
- Elected in late 2023, the current Board of Directors inherited from the previous management twelve open international and local cases before FIFA and the CAS, *“some of which are at advanced stages and threaten the club with point deductions or massive financial penalties.”* Despite limited resources, it resolved eight international cases in a short time. The Board of Directors’ handling of the Player’s case demonstrates a transparent and strategic approach to managing inherited obligations, rather than an attempt to evade or contest FIFA’s decisions. This is evidenced by the fact that, prior to the issuance of the CAS Award, during its Board of Directors’ meeting of 28 January 2025, the Club identified the Player as a payment priority upon receipt of new funding. This demonstrates the Club’s good faith and genuine intent to comply with its obligations.
- In June 2025, the Club drew up a roadmap that included a major governance reform plan to improve the *“qualification of the club's administrative and executive staff”* and prevent future administrative or legal failures. *“In this context, the club received an official offer from an international training entity specialized in institutional*

performance development in the sports sector. [...] The offer included the implementation of a comprehensive three-day simulation training program, focusing on enhancing the efficiency of vital departments within the club through a virtual environment that simulates the practical realities of the pressures of the Egyptian Premier League. [...] The program is based on simulating administrative crises, disciplinary situations, managing relationships with international entities (such as FIFA), and preparing strategic responses within an advanced regulatory framework.” Such a program is fully aligned with FIFA’s standards. This proactive initiative reflects the Club’s genuine commitment to institutional reforms, and the FIFA Disciplinary Committee’s failure to consider it disregards essential mitigating factors justifying a reduction or cancellation of the sanctions.

- The Club made multiple proposals for a payment plan or an amicable settlement to the Player’s counsel. Unfortunately, all were declined, *“leaving the Club with no choice but to seek relief through CAS”*.
- The CHF 20,000 fine is excessive given the Club’s cooperation and lack of bad faith.
- The *“additional disciplinary compensation amount”* of USD 311,093.27 is disproportionate to the Club’s financial capacity, violating the principle of proportionality under Article 17 of the FIFA Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players (RSTP) and CAS jurisprudence. Given the Club’s documented financial hardship and the upcoming season’s heightened relegation risk, such a heavy burden could cause irreparable harm. Moreover, *“[given] that the club is one of the historical pillars of Egyptian football, excessive financial penalties may undermine local competitive balance and harm the reputation of the local system before FIFA.”*
- *“[The] Club affirms that [the Player] is highly respected for both his talent and character. Any tension in the past was due to former management. The Club is proud to have contributed to his recovery and resurgence culminating in his becoming top scorer in the Tunisian league and a national team member”*.

B. The Respondents

FIFA

43. In its Answer, FIFA submitted the following requests for relief:

“In view of all the above, FIFA requests the Panel:

- a. To reject the [Club’s] appeal in its entirety;*
- b. To confirm the Appealed Decision; and*
- c. To order the [Club] to bear all costs incurred with the present procedure and to cover all the legal expenses of FIFA related to the present procedure.”*

44. FIFA’s submissions, in essence, may be summarized as follows:

- The Appealed Decision arose from disciplinary proceedings against the Club for breaching Article 21 FDC by failing to comply with a CAS Award. Article 21 FDC *“provides FIFA with a legal tool ensuring to a certain extent that decisions passed by the relevant authority within FIFA (or CAS following an appeal) are respected and ergo the rights of players or clubs are finally guarded”*.
- *“It is undisputed that the [Club], despite having initiated several proceedings before CAS (CAS 2024/A/10331, CAS 2025/O/11158, CAS 2025/A/11515, and CAS 2025/A/11555) with the sole aim of further delaying the fulfilment of its financial obligations towards the Player, has failed to pay the amounts owed under the CAS Award. In fact, despite its alleged attempts to demonstrate good faith ‘to comply with FIFA’s decisions,’ [the Club] has not even made a partial payment”*.
- The Club cannot reasonably claim that it is acting in good faith. Its conduct demonstrates a pattern of delay and avoidance rather than genuine cooperation. While attempting to portray itself as making every possible effort to comply with its financial obligations, the Club has in fact initiated multiple proceedings before CAS concerning the same contractual dispute, thereby prolonging the resolution of the matter and obstructing the Player’s right to receive the amounts due. Furthermore, by shifting the blame to external actors—such as the EFA, the sponsor, or the bank — the Club seeks to shift responsibility for its own failures. The alleged reliance on a bank loan that supposedly *“stumbled in the final stages”* does not establish good faith but rather confirms the Club’s lack of effective measures to fulfil its obligations. Genuine good faith would require the Club to take concrete and timely steps to pay the Player, not to rely on uncertain third-party arrangements or to engage in repeated litigation to avoid enforcement of a final and binding award.
- *“The Club also attempts to justify its default by invoking that [it] is ‘suffering from documented financial circumstances’. However, as consistently held by CAS jurisprudence, financial hardship or currency fluctuations are not considered a case of force majeure and cannot exempt a debtor from fulfilling its contractual obligations in time, nor can they be relied upon as a defence in disciplinary proceedings. [...] It shall be recalled that the CAS jurisprudence has consistently confirmed that the financial problems of a debtor do not exonerate it from paying its obligations to the creditor.”*
- The purported financial hardship of the Club is entirely unsubstantiated. So its alleged impossibility to execute the payment of the Player’s claim or that the bank loan was actually suspended.
- The FIFA Disciplinary Committee’s role is limited to verifying whether a final and binding decision has been respected, without any power to review or amend its substance. *“Moreover, CAS should only address the question of whether the [Club] respected and fulfilled that decision, but it can no longer address its content.”* The Club challenges the compensation awarded by the CAS (USD 311,093.27) and seeks either its annulment or its reduction. However, this amount was reviewed and established in the CAS Award, which became final and binding. Any attempt by

the Club to challenge that amount within the framework of these arbitration proceedings is inadmissible.

- *“Since the [Club] did not question the proportionality of the fine nor the imposition of the potential registration ban, FIFA simply refers to the Appealed Decision, which [it finds] to be a sound and well-grounded decision.”*

The Player

45. In his Answer, the Player submitted the following requests for relief:

“For all the above reasons and for those the panel would find relevant, we respectfully ask the panel:

- 1. Reject the Appeal in its entirety;*
- 2. Confirm the FIFA Disciplinary Committee Decision of 9 May 2025 (FDD-23873), including the fine and the registration ban;*
- 3. Order the Club to bear the full costs of these proceedings*
- 4. Contribute to the Player’s legal fees according to the panel’s discretion.”*

46. The Player’s submissions, in essence, may be summarized as follows:

- The appeal constitutes nothing more than an attempt to delay execution of the CAS Award and the subsequent Appealed Decision rendered by the FIFA Disciplinary Commission.
- The appeal is inadmissible and abusive, as it seeks to challenge matters definitively adjudicated in the CAS Award. The compensation amount established in the CAS Award is final and binding, leaving no room for further review or modification. Despite this, the Club seeks to misuse the present arbitration proceedings to indirectly challenge and re-examine the amount determined in the CAS Award. *“The Club’s attempt to revisit the compensation or escape execution is inadmissible and contrary to the principle of legal certainty and a clear infringement of the principle of Res judicata”.*
- The Club misunderstands the nature of the amount of USD 311,093.27, which is not a disciplinary sanction, but the compensation awarded to the Player for the Club’s breach of the Employment Contract, as confirmed by the final CAS Award.
- *“Article 21 FIFA FDC explicitly provides that failure to comply with a final FIFA or CAS decision results in fines, registration bans, and potentially stricter sanctions, including points deduction or relegation in cases of persistent noncompliance. [...] The FIFA Disciplinary Committee had no discretion to alter the amounts due under the CAS Award. Its role was limited to verifying compliance and in case of inexecution of the award, it shall apply disciplinary sanctions against the debtor. [...] As the Club had not paid any amount, the Committee correctly applied Article 21 FDC and imposed a fine, a final deadline, and a registration ban until full payment of the amounts awarded by CAS.”*

- The Club has acted in bad faith since October 2022. It has repeatedly refused the Player's reasonable settlement offers, revealing its unwillingness to fulfil its obligations. Instead, the Club has engaged in continuous procedural manoeuvres before the DRC, CAS and FIFA disciplinary bodies without making any payment. The Club's alleged financial hardship is irrelevant, as financial difficulties do not exempt a party from compliance with its obligations.

V. JURISDICTION

47. Article R47 (1) of the Code provides 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”.

48. According to Article 50 (1) of the applicable FIFA Statutes, *“Appeals against final decisions passed by FIFA and its bodies shall be lodged with CAS within 21 days of receipt of the decision in question”.*
49. The Appealed Decision also includes a note confirming CAS jurisdiction, stating that under Article 50 (1) of the FIFA Statutes and Articles 52 and 61 of the FDC, it may be appealed to CAS within twenty-one (21) days of notification.
50. The Parties rely on the above provisions in conferring jurisdiction to CAS, which is further confirmed by the Order of Procedure duly signed by them.
51. It follows that the CAS has jurisdiction to decide on the present dispute.

VI. ADMISSIBILITY

52. Article R49 of the Code provides 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. When a procedure is initiated, a party may request the Division President or the President of the Panel, if a Panel has been already constituted, to terminate if the statement of appeal is late. The Division President or the President of the Panel renders her/his decision after any submission made by the other parties.”

53. The admissibility of the Appeal was not contested by the Respondents.

54. The Appealed Decision was notified to the Club on 10 June 2025. The Club lodged its Statement of Appeal with CAS on 29 June 2025.
55. Consequently, the appeal was filed within the deadline of twenty-one (21) days set by Article 50 (1) of the applicable FIFA Statutes. It complied with all other requirements of Articles R48 and R49 of the Code, including the payment of the CAS Court Office fee.
56. It follows that the appeal is admissible.

VII. APPLICABLE LAW

57. Article R58 of the Code provides 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”.

58. Article 49 (2) of the FIFA Statutes provides as follows:

“The provisions of the CAS Code of Sports-related Arbitration shall apply to the proceedings. CAS shall primarily apply the various regulations of FIFA and, additionally, Swiss law”.

59. On the basis of the clear wording of Article R58 of the Code and Article 49 (2) FIFA Statutes, the present dispute shall be resolved primarily according to the various regulations of FIFA and, additionally, Swiss law.
60. With respect to the applicable edition of the FDC, Article 4 (1) of the 2023 edition provides that it applies to *“all disciplinary offences committed following the date on which it comes into force.”* The 2023 edition of the FDC entered into force on 1 February 2023, whereas the disciplinary offence committed by the Club — namely, the failure to comply with the CAS Award — occurred on 27 March 2025. Accordingly, the 2023 edition of the FDC governs the present case.

VIII. THE MERITS

61. In its Appealed Decision, the FIFA Disciplinary Committee found the Club guilty of *“failing to comply in full with the FIFA decision rendered on 12 January 2024 (Ref. FPSD-10961) as modified by the decision of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (Ref. CAS 2024/A/10331).”*

62. In view of the Club's arguments raised in its Appeal Brief, the issues to be decided by the Panel are:

- A. Did the Club fail to comply with the CAS Award?
- B. Did the Club have valid reasons not to comply with the CAS Award or was the Club's delay in complying with the CAS Award due to extraordinary economic conditions that amount to force majeure?
- C. Is the sanction imposed by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee disproportionate?

A. *Did the Club fail to comply with the CAS Award?*

63. Article 21 (1) FDC reads as follows:

“Anyone who fails to pay another person (such as a player, a coach or a club) or FIFA a sum of money in full or part, even though instructed to do so by a body, a committee, a subsidiary or an instance of FIFA or a CAS decision (financial decision), or anyone who fails to comply with another final decision (non-financial decision) passed by a body, a committee, a subsidiary or an instance of FIFA, or by CAS:

- a) will be fined for failing to comply with a decision and receive any pertinent additional disciplinary measure; and, if necessary:*
- b) will be granted a final deadline of 30 days in which to pay the amount due or to comply with the non-financial decision;*
- c) [...]*
- d) in the case of clubs, upon expiry of the aforementioned final deadline and in the event of persistent default or failure to comply in full with the decision within the period stipulated, a ban on registering new players will be issued until the complete amount due is paid or the non-financial decision is complied with. A deduction of points or relegation to a lower division may also be ordered in addition to a ban on registering new players in the event of persistent failure (i.e. the ban on registering new players has been served for more than three entire and consecutive registration periods following the notification of the decision), repeated offences or serious infringements or if no full registration ban could be imposed or served for any reason [...].”*

64. Pursuant to the CAS Award, the Club was granted a final deadline of thirty days from the date of notification to pay to the Player the total amount of USD 361,307.27, together with applicable interest.

65. In its Statement of Appeal, the Club does not “*challenge the legality of the CAS award*” but requests reconsideration of the method and timing for the implementation of the

decision in light of its current financial constraints and the unsuccessful outcome of settlement negotiations.

66. The Club's request has already been addressed by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee in its Appealed Decision. In essence, the FIFA Disciplinary Committee found that it lacked the authority to re-examine or alter the enforcement modalities of the CAS Award, or to grant payment plans or extensions of time, as such arrangements fall exclusively within the discretion of the Player as the creditor.
67. The Panel fully concurs with the FIFA Disciplinary Commission and confirms that, just like the FIFA Disciplinary Committee, its own role is limited to assessing whether the requirements of the FDC have been met and whether the non-compliance with the CAS Award is duly established.
68. In the present case, both the Club and the Player blame each other for the failure of the negotiations to reach a settlement. Nevertheless, it remains undisputed that the Club has not yet settled any part of the sum due to the Player. Consequently, the non-compliance with the CAS Award is clearly established. The Panel therefore concludes that the conditions set forth under Article 21 FDC are met.

B. Did the Club have valid reasons not to comply with the CAS Award or was the Club's delay in complying with the CAS Award due to extraordinary economic conditions that amount to force majeure?

69. In substance the Club claims that it is facing financial difficulties, which were aggravated when a bank loan intended to settle its debts collapsed after a sponsor withdrew its guarantee on 28 May 2025. Although the subsequent cancellation of its relegation allowed the Club to restart the loan process, administrative delays prevented timely payment. The Club contends that these circumstances amount to force majeure, as the delays were beyond its control and made earlier repayment impossible. The Club's further maintains that its current Board of Directors inherited a particularly difficult financial and administrative situation from the previous management. Despite these challenges, the Club contends that it has undertaken considerable efforts to stabilize its affairs and to settle its outstanding obligations, including those owed to the Player. The Club claims that these actions demonstrate its good faith and its genuine intention to comply with the CAS Award.
70. Force majeure is used to describe a situation or event, which is beyond the control of the parties, which prevents them from fulfilling their contractual obligations and for which they believe they should not carry any liability or obligations. Under FIFA Regulations and Swiss law, there is no statutory definition of force majeure. According to the Swiss Federal Tribunal, there is force majeure in the presence of an unforeseeable and extraordinary event that occurs with irresistible force. The conditions for the occurrence of force majeure are to be narrowly interpreted, since force majeure introduces an exception to the binding force of an obligation (CAS 2021/A/7673 & CAS 2021/A/7699).
71. With respect to the burden of proof, Article 8 of the Swiss Civil Code ("SCC") states that *"Unless the law provides otherwise, the burden of proving the existence of an alleged fact*

shall rest on the person who derives rights from that fact". As a result, the Panel reaffirms the principle established by CAS jurisprudence that *"in CAS arbitration, any party wishing to prevail on a disputed issue must discharge its burden of proof, i.e. it must meet the onus to substantiate its allegations and to affirmatively prove the facts on which it relies with respect to that issue. In other words, the party which asserts facts to support its rights has the burden of establishing them. The Code sets forth an adversarial system of arbitral justice, rather than an inquisitorial one. Hence, if a party wishes to establish some facts and persuade the deciding body, it must actively substantiate its allegations with convincing evidence"* (CAS 2014/A/3546, para. 7.3 and references). In general, the burden of proof is satisfied whenever the judge is convinced of the truthfulness of a factual allegation based on objective grounds. Absolute certainty is not required. It is sufficient if the judge has no serious doubt about the existence of the alleged facts or if any remaining doubt appears to be tenuous (Judgements of the Swiss Federal Tribunal 4A_248/2022 of 2 August 2022, para. 4.1; 130 III 321, para. 3.3; CAS 2021/A/7673 – 7699 para. 91).

72. In the present case and in support of its position, the Club relies on the following documents:

- An internal summary table listing eight financial cases involving six players and two clubs, reflecting amounts that the Club appears to have paid pursuant to proceedings before FIFA or the CAS (the "Summary Table").
- The translation from Arabic into English of the minutes of a meeting held on 28 January 2025, which record the deliberations and resolutions adopted by the Club's Board of Directors (the "Minutes"). In this document, the status of several international and local legal cases is addressed. Regarding the Player, the Minutes merely report that *"FIFA issued a ruling in favour of player Firas Chaouat, obligating the Club to pay USD 902,627. The Club appealed the ruling, and the case is currently pending before the CAS"*. It is also indicated that the Club *"settled all dues owed to local players from the beginning of its term. Players received their full entitlements for the 2023/2024 season, as well as 50 % of their dues for the ongoing 2024/2025 season up to the present date [and that] there are outstanding international financial obligations that remain difficult to settle due to the Club's current lack of liquidity."* According to these Minutes, *"[the] Chairman of the Board [...] clarified that the financial situation of the Club is exceedingly difficult, with no available liquidity to meet the Club's urgent financial obligations or the international liabilities that are currently due. [He] further noted that the Club's sole source of income at present is the sponsorship contract with United Company for Sports Marketing and Advertising Services, which is insufficient to cover all of the Club's financial obligations. Consequently, he proposed obtaining a loan from one of the Egyptian banks to settle these debts [...]. The Club may obtain a loan in the amount of EGP 60,000,000 [...] secured against the sponsorship contract."*
- A translation from Arabic into English of a letter, dated 19 March 2025, sent by the Directorate of Youth and Sports, of the Arab Republic of Egypt, approving, in

principle, the Club's request to obtain a loan of EGP 60,000,000 from an Egyptian bank, secured by its sponsorship contract with United Company for Sports Marketing and Advertising Services. However, the approval is conditional on the Ministry's prior review and endorsement of the draft loan agreement, and on the formal written consent of United Company for Sports Marketing and Advertising Services to be included as a contracting party.

- A copy of an email dated 16 June 2025 whereby a company, SportsAdmin, is presenting to the Club an offer for “*a tailored simulation-based capacity building program designed to prepare [its] executive and operational teams for the complex and challenging environment of the upcoming Egyptian Premier League competition*”. SportsAdmin has invited the Club to attend a three-day training session designed to allow the Club's management team “*to explore how this innovative learning approach can contribute directly to the club's preparations for next season*”.
 - A document entitled “*Roadmap for Ismaily SC for Full Compliance and Resolution of International Disputes Under FIFA Supervision*”, dated 18 June 2025 and submitted to the FIFA General Secretariat and FIFA Governance, Audit and Compliance Committee (the “Roadmap”). This document provides an overview of the background and context of the Club's situation, which is similar to the arguments put forward in these arbitration proceedings. It describes the loan freeze due to the Club's initial decline in sports ranking, the disciplinary proceedings due to the breach of ban of registering new players imposed in the DRC Decision, the loan of EGP 60,000,000 approved by the Egyptian Ministry of Youth and Sports, the fact that “*Appeals to CAS are procedural and not substantive, and do not aim to annul the rulings, but only to request a regulatory time extension*” (emphasis added). In this Roadmap, the Club formally requests FIFA's authorization to open an exceptional registration window, justified by a critical shortage of players. The Club maintains that this measure is essential in order to prevent sporting and institutional collapse, and that it is in line with FIFA's principles of fairness and competitive equity.
73. The Panel observes that none of the documents submitted by the Club constitute credible or verifiable evidence of its actual financial situation or of the alleged economic constraints invoked to justify its non-compliance with the CAS Award. In particular, the evidence on file does not demonstrate, in any manner whatsoever, that the Club's delay in paying the Player's claim was the result of extraordinary economic circumstances in Egypt amounting to force majeure, nor does it establish any causal link between such circumstances and the Club's inability to comply with its financial obligations.
74. First, the Summary Table merely lists a series of FIFA and CAS cases, the amounts involved, and their status. While it may demonstrate that the Club has resolved some disputes, it provides no supporting financial data—such as audited accounts, cash-flow statements, bank confirmations, or evidence of payments actually made—that would substantiate the Club's claim of insolvency or extraordinary hardship. On the contrary, according to the Summary Table, it appears that between January and September 2024 the Club was able to settle eight cases, paying in this context more than USD 2,814,126,

EGP 857,293, and CHF 4,000, plus 5% interest. This demonstrates that the Club had the financial resources to comply with the CAS Award in favor of the Player but chose instead to prioritize the settlement of other debts.

75. Second, the Minutes simply reproduce the Club's own assertions that its financial situation is "*exceedingly difficult*" and that liquidity is lacking. These statements are uncorroborated, offering no objective explanation or documentary evidence of the causes, magnitude, or duration of the alleged difficulties. The fact that the Board of Directors discussed obtaining a loan does not in itself establish that the Club was unable, rather than unwilling, to pay its debts, nor does it demonstrate the existence of unforeseen and unavoidable circumstances constituting force majeure.
76. Third, the letter from the Directorate of Youth and Sports conveys only a conditional governmental approval for the Club to seek a bank loan. It does not confirm that the loan was ever granted, disbursed, or used to address the Club's liabilities. It should also be noted that in the submissions it filed in the present arbitration proceedings, the Club provided no indication as to what became of this loan — whether it was granted and, if so, when. According to its submissions before the FIFA Disciplinary Committee, the Club asserted that the loan would allow it to fully pay the Player by no later than 10 June 2025. In the Roadmap, the loan was supposed to be disbursed in July 2025. In its Statement of Appeal, the Club requested a "*structured payment plan starting immediately upon the disbursement of the Club's bank loan in August 2025*". To date, no amount has been paid to the Player.
77. Fourth, the email from SportsAdmin regarding a proposed three-day training program is irrelevant to the Club's financial capacity. It concerns a voluntary management-training initiative and provides no information about the Club's revenue, expenditure, or liquidity.
78. Fifth, the Roadmap is a strategic and narrative document prepared by the Club. It reiterates arguments already advanced in these arbitration proceedings but remains entirely declaratory. It offers no independent financial verification—no audited figures, creditor correspondence, or bank statements—and therefore cannot substantiate a claim of objective financial impossibility. Much more, this Roadmap appears primarily aimed at obtaining from FIFA the authorization to open an exceptional registration window and the lifting of the transfer ban imposed in the DRC Decision and subsequently confirmed on several occasions by both FIFA (FDD-23981) and the CAS (CAS 2024/A/10331 and CAS 2025/A/11515).
79. Taken together, these documents describe intentions, internal discussions, and administrative proposals but do not demonstrate that the Club's financial hardship is exceptional, unforeseeable, or beyond its control, as required to establish force majeure. The evidence merely indicates that the Club faces ordinary financial management challenges typical of sporting entities, not circumstances that legally excuse non-compliance with a binding CAS award.
80. In addition, and according to well-established CAS jurisprudence, financial difficulties are not an excuse for a failure to pay a debt or to comply with a CAS award (among others, CAS 2022/A/8917 para 60; CAS 2020/A/7346, 7347 & 7348 para. 126; CAS

2019/A/6129 para. 53; CAS 2018/A/5838 para. 95; CAS 2018/A/5802 para. 84; CAS 2013/A/3358 para. 59; CAS 2006/A/1008 para. 19).

81. In light of the foregoing, the Club failed to comply fully with its payment obligations under the CAS Award without any valid justification, and hence, the Panel finds that all conditions provided in article 21 (1) FDC for the imposition of disciplinary sanctions against a Club are met.

C. Is the sanction imposed by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee disproportionate?

82. In its Appealed Decision, the only disciplinary sanction imposed is a CHF 20,000 fine. The FIFA Disciplinary Committee also granted the Club *“a final deadline of 30 days as from notification of the present decision in which to pay the amount due. Upon expiry of the aforementioned final deadline and in the event of persistent default or failure to comply in full with the decision within the period stipulated, a ban on registering new players will be issued until the complete amount due is paid.”*
83. In its statement of Appeal, the Club only sought to obtain the annulment or reduction of the disciplinary fine of CHF 20,000 and requested a *“structured payment plan starting immediately upon the disbursement of the Club's bank loan in August 2025”*. However, in its requests for relief submitted with its Appeal Brief, the Club no longer referred to the CHF 20,000 fine but requested the Panel to *“annul or reduce the additional disciplinary compensation amount imposed at \$311,093.27.”*
84. The Panel notes that the amount of USD 311,093.27 does not constitute a fine but represents the compensation awarded by the CAS for the Club's breach of the Employment Contract with the Player. This amount does not have the character of a sanction. It was determined in the CAS Award, which has become final and binding upon the Parties. The subsequent disciplinary proceedings before the FIFA Disciplinary Committee were therefore not intended to reassess the merits of that award, but solely to determine whether the Club had complied with the terms of a final and binding decision. This is consistent with CAS precedents (among others CAS 2020/A/7346, 7347 & 7348 para. 89).
85. Accordingly, the Club's request for relief seeking the annulment or reduction of *“the additional disciplinary compensation amount imposed at \$311,093.27”* can be rejected without further consideration.
86. The only question that remains is whether the CHF 20,000 fine and the conditional ban on registering new players is proportionate.
87. It should be noted that, in accordance with established CAS jurisprudence, a CAS panel should show deference to the decisions of sports governing bodies regarding the proportionality of sanctions. These sanctions can only be amended by a CAS panel if they are evidently and grossly disproportionate to the offence (CAS 2024/A/10609, para. 129 and cited cases). As put in another CAS precedent, *“[the] CAS may amend a disciplinary decision of a FIFA judicial body only if the relevant FIFA judicial body exceeded the margin of discretion accorded to it by the principle of association autonomy, i.e. only*

where the relevant FIFA judicial body must be held to have acted arbitrarily. This is, however, not the case if the CAS panel merely disagrees with a specific sanction, but only if the sanction concerned is to be considered as evidently and grossly disproportionate to the offence” (CAS 2022/A/8731). The failure to try to settle the debt, to negotiate any agreement with the creditor or to make a partial payment is also relevant with respect to the issue of proportionality of the sanction (CAS 2018/A/6239).

88. The fine of CHF 20,000 imposed on the Club cannot be regarded as disproportionate in light of the circumstances of the case. The Club failed to comply with a final and binding CAS award. Such conduct constitutes a serious offence and a breach of the duty to respect and implement enforceable decisions, thereby undermining the authority and credibility of both FIFA’s judicial bodies and the CAS.
89. As an aggravating factor, the Club admitted to having used legal manoeuvres to buy time. This is illustrated in the Roadmap, where the Club confirmed that *“Appeals to CAS are procedural and not substantive, and do not aim to annul the rulings, but only to request a regulatory time extension”*. In the present case, the Club initiated four CAS Procedure concerning the same dispute (CAS 2025/A/11555, CAS 2025/O/11158; CAS 2025/A/11515; CAS 2024/A/10331). This behavior hardly reflects the good faith approach the Club claims to have taken in resolving the Player’s claim.
90. The Club maintains that it dealt with the present matter in an honest and transparent way, although no evidence supports this. It asserts that it placed the Player among its payment priorities and attempts to support this with the fact that the Player’s name was mentioned during the Board of Directors’ meeting of 28 January 2025. The Minutes merely report that *“FIFA issued a ruling in favour of player Firas Chaouat, obligating the Club to pay USD 902,627. The Club appealed the ruling, and the case is currently pending before the CAS”*. There is no statement expressing an intention to pay the Player as a priority. Quite to the contrary, instead of settling its debts to the Player, the Club hired several new players despite the registration ban remaining in force. Moreover, the Club attempted to delay matters by invoking an expected loan of EGP 60 million, but its maturity date has since passed without any payment being made to the Player.
91. The FIFA Disciplinary Committee granted the Club a final thirty-day deadline to pay the Player the contractually agreed one-off penalty. Only in the event of non-payment within that deadline would a registration ban be issued until full compliance, pursuant to Article 21(1)(d) FDC. Hence, the sanction is conditional rather than automatic: should the payment be made within the prescribed deadline, no sanction would be applied.
92. In addition, this deadline is currently suspended for the duration of the present arbitration proceedings, as consistent CAS jurisprudence confirms that a decision of a purely financial nature is not enforceable while under appeal (among others CAS 2020/A/6769 para. 48).
93. With regard to the transfer ban, FIFA Circular No. 1681 dated 11 July 2019, issued under the 2019 edition of the FDC clarifies that *“[as] a standard disciplinary measure, FIFA will impose a transfer ban on clubs not paying outstanding amounts until they have paid all of their debts. A transfer ban has shown to be the more effective instrument for this*

purpose”. A transfer ban imposed on a club for failing to fulfil its financial obligations serves as an essential deterrent against non-compliance, reinforcing the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* (CAS 2022/A/8731 para. 75).

94. The transfer ban is explicitly provided for in Article 21 (1)(d) FDC. The FIFA Disciplinary Committee therefore acted within its powers in imposing such a measure.
95. In light of the foregoing, the Panel concludes that the FIFA Disciplinary Committee acted within its regulatory authority, and that its decision to impose a transfer ban on the Club for failing to comply with its financial obligations cannot “*be considered evidently and grossly disproportionate to the offence*”.

D. Conclusion

96. In view of the foregoing, the Panel finds that the Appealed Decision must be confirmed.
97. All other claims and further conclusions of the Parties are dismissed.

IX. COSTS

(...)

* * * * *

ON THESE GROUNDS

The Court of Arbitration for Sport rules that:

1. The Appeal filed on 29 June 2025 by Ismaili Sports Club against the decision rendered on 9 May 2025 by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee (reference number FDD-23873) is dismissed.
2. The decision rendered on 9 May 2025 by the FIFA Disciplinary Committee (reference number FDD-23873) is confirmed.
3. (...).
4. (...).
5. All other and further motions or prayers for relief are dismissed.

Seat of arbitration: Lausanne, Switzerland

Date: 9 December 2025

THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

Patrick Grandjean
President of the Panel

Rodrigo Arias Grillo
Arbitrator

Lars Hilliger
Arbitrator