



TAS / CAS

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

CAS 2025/A/11931 Belarusian Ski Union & al. v. International Ski & Snowboard Federation (FIS)

ARBITRAL AWARD

delivered by the

COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

sitting in the following composition:

President: Mr Vladimir Novak, Attorney-at-law, Brussels, Belgium

Arbitrators: Mr Siarhei Ilyich, Attorney-at-law in Minsk, Belarus
His Hon. James Robert Reid KC, Retired Judge in Liss, UK

in the arbitration between

Belarusian Ski Union, Minsk, Belarus

&

**Hanna Huskova, Anna Derugo, Anastasiya Andryianava, Ihar Drabiankou, and
Uladzislau Vazniuk**, Belarus

Represented by Mr Aleksandr Grebnev, President, and Ms Marina Novik, Attorney-at-law in
Belarus

Appellants

and

International Ski & Snowboard Federation (FIS), Oberhofen/Thunersee, Switzerland

Represented by Mr. David Rundle, Mr. Suhail Mayor and Ms. Irina Tuca, Bryan Cave Leighton
Paisner LLP (BCLP LLP) in London, United Kingdom

Respondent

and

Hanna Machakhina, Maria Shkanova and Hanna Karaliova, Belarus

Intervening Parties

I. PARTIES

1. The Belarusian Ski Union (“BSU”) is the national governing body for skiing and snowboarding in Belarus, with its registered office in Minsk, Belarus.
2. Ms. Hanna Huskova, Ms. Anna Derugo, Ms. Anastasiya Andryianava, Mr. Ihar Drabiankou, and Mr. Uladzislau Vazniuk (together with BSU, the “Appellants”), as well as Ms. Hanna Machakhina, Ms. Maria Shkanova, and Ms. Hanna Karaliova who participated in the present proceedings as intervening parties, are professional athletes affiliated with the BSU (“Athletes”).
3. The International Ski and Snowboard Federation (“FIS” or the “Respondent”) is the international official governing body for skiing and snowboarding, with its headquarters in Oberhofen/Thunersee, Switzerland. It has a membership of 141 national ski and snowboard associations, including the BSU.
4. The Appellants and the Respondent are collectively referred to as the “Parties”.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

5. Below is a summary of the relevant facts and allegations based on the Parties’ written submissions and evidence adduced. Additional facts and allegations found in the Parties’ submissions and evidence may be set out, where relevant, in connection with the legal discussion that follows. While the Panel has considered all facts, allegations, legal arguments, and evidence submitted by the Parties in the present proceedings, the Award refers only to the submissions and evidence which the Panel considers necessary to explain its reasoning.
6. On 21 October 2025, the FIS Council decided, by secret ballot, not to allow the participation of athletes from Russia and Belarus as Individual Neutral Athletes (“AINs”) in FIS qualification events for the Milano Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games and Paralympic Games (the “2026 Winter Olympic Games”) (the “Appealed Decision”).
7. On 22 October 2025, the Appellants learnt of the Appealed Decision through the official website of FIS, which announced that the FIS “*Council convened this Tuesday and voted not to facilitate the participation of athletes from Russia and Belarus as Individual Neutral Athletes (AIN)*”.
8. On 1 November 2025, FIS published on its official website the summary minutes of the Council meeting of 21 October 2025 at which the Appealed Decision was made (the “Summary Minutes”). The Summary Minutes show that the Appealed Decision was considered under agenda item 8, and that it was put to a vote. Following an initial vote on the participation of both Russian and Belarusian athletes as Individual Neutral Athletes (“AINs”), a second question was put to a vote concerning only Belarusian athletes, to which “*the majority of the Council voted with no*”. The second question

concerned whether the Respondent should “*permit athletes from Belarus to participate as AIN in FIS qualification events for the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games in strict compliance with the IOC eligibility criteria for AIN, provided each NSA shall retain discretion to determine whether athletes from the concerned nations may take part in qualification events held within its jurisdiction?*” The Summary Minutes further note as follows:

“The importance of following the FIS statutes were emphasised, and it was noted that Article 5.2 of the FIS statutes stipulate that the FIS activities shall be conducted in a politically neutral manner. It was further noted that the Olympic Charter have similar wording. Recent developments were discussed, including the IPC’s removal of its ban on Russian and Belarusian athletes, and a tribunal decision in bobsleigh finding that excluding neutral athletes is discriminatory. The Council also reviewed the survey results from more than 50% of the full member federations, which showed a 60/40 split of yes/no opinions in favour of Russian and Belarusian athletes participating in FIS qualification events as AIN. The anti-doping program for Russian athletes was confirmed to have continued uninterrupted, with international agencies conducting testing to ensure compliance. Council members expressed a range of views, with some advocating for continued exclusion due misuse of sport for political purposes, while others stressed the need to avoid discrimination based on nationality”.

9. On 26 October 2025, the Appellants sent a letter to FIS (the “Appellants’ Letter 1”). The Appellants’ Letter 1 set out that the Appealed Decision contravened FIS Statutes and requested, based on Article 10.2.1.13 and Article 15.71 of FIS Statutes, to “*provide documented rationale*” for the Appealed Decision and to “*explain the procedure for appealing*” the FIS Council’s decisions.
10. On 29 October 2025, FIS replied to the Appellants’ Letter 1. FIS stated that pursuant to Article 11.3 of the FIS Statutes, FIS Council was empowered to take the Appealed Decision as it did “*not fall within the exclusive competence*” of FIS Congress. FIS further stated that the requested documented rationale could not be provided as the Appealed Decision was taken by “*secret ballot*” and “*no Council Member is required to indicate how they voted or to provide reasons for their decision*”. FIS also outlined that whilst the FIS Statutes “*provide for an internal route of appeal through the FIS Congress*”, “*any decision taken by the FIS Congress would likely be appealed to the Court of Arbitration for Sport*”. Therefore, FIS proposed the alternative option of appealing to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (the “CAS”), available under Article 15.1 of the FIS Statutes, “*in the interest of all parties*”.
11. On 31 October 2025, the Appellants sent a letter to FIS (the “Appellants’ Letter 2”). The Appellants reiterated that the Appealed Decision contravened the FIS Statutes and maintained their request for the “*documented rationale*” of the Appealed Decision, “*including references to the rules or/and other regulations, as well as the factual grounds and evidence on which the Council relied*” when making the Appealed

Decision, and to “*recover [their] right to participate*” in international competitions and the 2026 Winter Olympic Games as AINs.

12. On 4 November 2025, FIS replied to the Appellants’ Letter 2. FIS reiterated that they would not provide the rationale for the Appealed Decision. FIS also provided the background to the FIS Council decision of 1 March 2022, which was taken “*in line with the IOC recommendation dated 28th February 2022*” that no Russian or Belarusian athletes could participate in any of the Respondent’s competitions “*because organisers could not ensure the safety and security of all athletes*”. FIS also noted that the FIS Council’s decisions are democratic decisions taken by way of a vote, and that no member of the FIS Council is required to indicate how they voted or to provide reasons for their decision.

III. PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

13. On 11 November 2025, the Appellants filed their Statement of Appeal and Urgent Request for Provisional Measures before the CAS against the Appealed Decision pursuant to Articles R27 and R47 of the Code of Sports-related Arbitration (the “Code”). The Appellants initially designated the International Olympic Committee (“IOC”) as the Second Respondent alongside FIS. On 14 November 2025, the Appellants informed the CAS Court Office that they (i) withdrew their appeal and prayers for relief insofar as directed against the IOC, and (ii) maintained the Appeal exclusively against FIS.
14. On 14 November 2025, the CAS Court Office confirmed the implementation of an expedited procedure and the procedural calendar agreed upon by the Parties
15. On 20 November 2025, the Appellants filed their Appeal Brief.
16. On 21 November 2025, Ms. Hanna Machakhina, Ms. Maria Shkanova, and Ms. Hanna Karaliova filed applications for intervention.
17. On 24 November 2025, the CAS Court Office confirmed that the hearing was scheduled for 26 November 2025 and invited the Respondent to comment on the intervention applications by 25 November 2025.
18. On 24 November 2025, the Respondent filed its Answer.
19. On 25 November 2025, the Respondent agreed with the applications for intervention filed by Ms. Hanna Machakhina, Ms. Maria Shkanova, and Ms. Hanna Karaliova, provided that no new arguments or evidence were introduced by the intervenors beyond what had already been submitted by the Appellants.
20. On 25 November 2025, the CAS granted the applications for intervention filed by Ms. Hanna Machakhina, Ms. Maria Shkanova, and Ms. Hanna Karaliova.

21. On 26 November 2025, a hearing took place through videoconference. The Panel was assisted by Ms. Amelia Moore, CAS Counsel, and Ms Katherine Trafford (in an administrative capacity with the Parties' consent), and joined by the following participants:
- For the Appellants:
 - Mr. Aleksandr Grebnev, President
 - Ms. Marina Novik, Counsel
 - For the Respondent:
 - Mr. David Rundle, Counsel
 - Mr. Suhail Mayor, Counsel
 - Ms. Aoife Keane, Representative for the Respondent
 - Ms. Charlotte Varela, Representative for the Respondent
22. The arguments raised by the Parties during the hearing are, where relevant, discussed in the corresponding Merits section of the Award.
23. At the outset of the hearing, the Parties confirmed that they had no procedural issues or objections.
24. During the hearing, the Parties had ample opportunity to present their case, submit their arguments and answer Panel's questions.
25. At the end of the hearing, the Parties did not raise any objections as to the procedure adopted by the Panel and confirmed that their right to be heard had been respected.

IV. SUBMISSIONS OF THE PARTIES

26. The Appellants' Appeal Brief contained the following requests for relief:

“Appellants respectively requests the CAS to rule as follows:

- 1. Set aside the FIS Council Decision of 21 October 2025, by which Belarusian athletes were unlawfully denied the opportunity to participate under neutral status in the qualification events for the 2026 OWG and/or the 2026 OWG.*
- 2. Order the FIS to immediately establish, implement and apply transparent, verifiable and objective neutral-participation criteria consistent with the IOC Principles 2025, the IOC Recommendations 2023 and the Olympic Charter, and to ensure that all Belarusian athletes who meet such criteria are allowed to compete in the 2026 OWG qualification events and/or the 2026 OWG.*

3. *Confirm that the IOC's direct application of AIN criteria is binding, and that any refusal, omission, or delay by the FIS cannot lawfully prevent Belarusian athletes from exercising their right to participate in the 2026 OWG qualification events and/or the 2026 OWG itself.*
 4. *Should the FIS continue to fail or delay, order that each Belarusian athlete's eligibility be assessed without further postponement by the FIS either (a) through direct application of the IOC AIN standards, or (b) via a corresponding request by the FIS to the IOC AIN Eligibility Review Panel (AINERP). In either case, the FIS must guarantee that such assessments are carried out in a fair, transparent, and verifiable manner, thereby approving athlete participation, ensuring full compliance with the Olympic framework, and safeguarding procedural fairness.*
 5. *Order the FIS to bear all costs incurred in connection with the present arbitration.*
 6. *Order the FIS to pay the Appellants a contribution towards their legal and other costs, to be fixed at the discretion of the CAS but in any event not less than EUR 30,000 (thirty thousand) net.*
27. In support of their relief, the Appellants relied on the following principal arguments:
- Violation of Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes:
 - Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes provides that the Respondent “*shall not allow any discrimination against national federations or individuals (competitors, officials, judges, delegates, etc.) on the grounds of race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, political affiliations, languages or abilities. FIS shall conduct its activities in a politically neutral manner.*”
 - The Appealed Decision constitutes discrimination based on nationality by expressly excluding the Athletes from the 2026 Winter Olympic Games solely on the basis of their Belarusian nationality. This exclusion was motivated by geopolitical considerations rather than individual conduct, thereby breaching both the non-discrimination requirement and the obligation of political neutrality enshrined in Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes.
 - The discriminatory nature of the Appealed Decision is further evidenced by the absence of any individual assessment of the affected Athletes. The Respondent did not examine whether the affected Athletes met the International Olympic Committee (the “IOC”) eligibility criteria for AINs or whether they complied with obligations to refrain from supporting Russian aggression. Instead, as acknowledged by the Respondent, the Appealed Decision was made in line with the IOC recommendation dated 28 February 2022 (the “IOC Recommendation 2022”), that no Russian or

Belarusian athlete should participate in any FIS competition because organizers could not ensure the safety and security of all athletes. This made the Appealed Decision a “*blanket exclusion*” which “*constitutes a textbook case of discrimination based on a personal characteristic explicitly protected under Article 5.2*” of the FIS Statutes.

- Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes is a binding statutory rule, not merely an aspirational statement. It applies to the conduct of all the Respondent’s bodies and, therefore, any decision taken in violation of Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes is invalid.
- Violation of the Olympic Charter:
 - Rules 1 to 7 of the Olympic Charter set out the Fundamental Principles of Olympism. These include the principles of non-discrimination, political neutrality, and universality.
 - Rule 26 of the Olympic Charter expressly defines the mission and role of International Federations recognised by the IOC, such as the Respondent. Namely, *inter alia*, “*to establish and enforce, in accordance with the Olympic spirit, the rules concerning the practice of their respective sports and to ensure their application*” and “*to contribute to the achievement of the goals set out in the Olympic Charter, in particular by way of the spread of Olympism and Olympic education*”. Accordingly, international federations must comply with the Olympic Charter, the decisions of the IOC, and the principles adopted by the IOC. This includes the IOC Recommended Conditions of Participation for Individual Neutral Athletes and Support Personnel with a Russian or Belarusian Passport in International Sports Competitions Organised by the International Federations and International Sports Event Organisers dated 28 March 2023 (the “IOC Recommendations 2023”) and the IOC Principles Relating to the Implementation of the Participation for Individual Neutral Athletes and their Support Personnel with a Russian or Belarusian Passport at the Olympic Winter Games Milano Cortina 2026 dated 19 September 2025 (the “IOC Principles 2025”).
 - The Appealed Decision contravened the Olympic Charter, the IOC Recommendations 2023 and the IOC Principles 2025 and was, therefore, *ultra vires*. This is because the Appealed Decision excluded the Athletes solely on the basis of their Belarusian nationality, without any individualised assessment in violation of the Olympic Charter’s Fundamental Principles of Olympism.

- Unlawful departure from prior conduct:
 - On 1 March 2022, FIS Council held a meeting to consider the IOC Recommendation 2022 to bar Russian and Belarusian athletes from international competitions. FIS Council decided to prohibit Russian and Belarusian athletes on a temporary suspension, on the basis of ensuring the safety and security of all athletes, in line with the IOC Recommendation 2022.
 - On 21 October 2025, the Respondent directly contradicted the binding IOC Principles 2025 and IOC Recommendations 2023.
 - The Respondent confirmed that the FIS Council decisions of 1 March 2022 and 21 October 2025 were made in line with the IOC Recommendation 2022, demonstrating that the Respondent considers the IOC Recommendation 2022 as the basis for excluding Belarusian athletes from the Respondent's competitions.
 - The Appealed Decision's reliance on the IOC Recommendation 2022, while disregarding the IOC Recommendations 2023 and the IOC Principles 2025, exposes a selective adherence to IOC instruments. Such selective adherence is incompatible with procedural fairness and demonstrates the arbitrariness of the Appealed Decision.
- Breach of personality rights:
 - Article 28 of the Swiss Civil Code safeguards personality rights, encompassing all essential aspects of an individual's personal integrity. Any infringement of these rights is unlawful unless it is justified by consent of the affected person, an overriding interest, or law.
 - An international federation, such as the Respondent, cannot circumvent its legal duties towards individuals under Article 28 of the Swiss Civil Code, and any selective compliance with regulatory frameworks may constitute arbitrary conduct that results in a breach of Article 28 of the Swiss Civil Code.
 - By failing to establish clear and objective AIN eligibility criteria, despite the guidance provided by the IOC Principles 2025 and the IOC Recommendations 2023, the Respondent infringed the Appellants' personality rights protected under Swiss law.
- Breach of tripartite proportionality test:
 - Under Swiss law and CAS jurisprudence (for example, ATF 138 III 322 §4.3.1, CAS 2017/A/5031 and CAS 2005/O/976 & 986), any restrictive

measure imposed by an international federation must satisfy a tripartite proportionality test. Namely, (i) the measure must pursue a legitimate objective; (ii) the measure must be suitable to achieve that objective; and (iii) the measure must not go beyond what is necessary to achieve the objective.

- The Appealed Decision fails all three elements of the tripartite proportionality test. First, the Respondent did not articulate any legitimate objective justifying the exclusionary effect of the Appealed Decision. Second, the Appealed Decision was not suitable as it was manifestly overbroad, as it excluded athletes based on their nationality. Third, viable and less restrictive alternatives were available and practicable, such as the adoption of a clear and objective AIN eligibility criteria consistent with the guidance set out in the IOC Recommendations 2023 and the IOC Principles 2025.
- By failing the tripartite proportionality test, the Respondent acted arbitrarily and unlawfully, in breach of Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes and the general principles of Swiss association law.
- Breach of the right to be heard and basic procedural rights:
 - The Respondent did not give the Appellants a chance to defend themselves or to exercise their right to be heard, and, without justification, declined to convene the Respondent's Congress or permit any appeal or review of the Appealed Decision.
 - It is a widely recognised principle, affirmed in CAS decisions (for example, CAS 2007/A/1392 and CAS 2013/A/3155), that the right to be heard must be observed, even where no rule explicitly provides for it.
 - By denying the Appellants the right to be heard, the Respondent denied the Appellants basic procedural rights such as the right to examine the evidence and materials that were used in the consideration and formed the basis of the Appealed Decision. Accordingly, the Appealed Decision was adopted in breach of fundamental procedural guarantees and should not be upheld.

28. The Respondent's Answer contained the following requests for relief:

“59.It follows from the foregoing that there is no basis for the Appellants' allegations in the Appeal Brief, such that the Appellants are not entitled to the relief sought. The appeal should be dismissed.

60.The Respondent requests that the Appellants bear all its costs and the costs of the arbitration”.

29. In support of its relief, the Respondent relied on the following principal arguments:
- The Appealed Decision was *intra vires* and procedurally valid:
 - For a decision by the FIS Council to be *intra vires*, it has to satisfy three conditions. Namely, (i) the object of the decision has to fall within the competence of the FIS Council (the Competency Condition); (ii) the decision has to have been taken pursuant to a vote which meets the necessary quorum requirement of at least twelve Council Members including the President (the Quorum Condition); and (iii) the decision has to reflect the majority's view (the Majority Condition).
 - The Appealed Decision concerned the strategy and overall business of the Respondent, under Article 11.3.2 of the FIS Statutes, and did not fall within the exclusive competence of FIS Congress, under Article 11.3.1 of the FIS Statutes. The Competency Condition was, therefore, met. By way of example, FIS Council had previously exercised the same competence on a comparable matter, the participation of athletes from Russia and Belarus in the Respondent's competitions on 1 March 2022, which was not challenged by FIS Congress.
 - All 22 Council Members were present at the time of adopting the Appealed Decision, including the President. The Quorum Condition was, therefore, satisfied.
 - The Appealed Decision's vote reflected the majority's view. The Majority Condition was, therefore, also satisfied.
 - Accordingly, the FIS Council acted *intra vires* and in pursuance of the competence granted upon it by the FIS Statutes and properly exercised the discretion it enjoys under the provisions of the same instrument. The Appellants mistakenly conflate the concept of acting *ultra vires* (in other words, beyond the scope of its powers as conferred by the FIS Statutes) and the merits of the decision taken in pursuance of those powers.
 - No violation of Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes:
 - Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes requires the Respondent to conduct its activities in a politically neutral manner and prohibits discrimination.
 - The Summary Minutes show that the FIS Council did consider Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes, including the requirements of political neutrality and non-discrimination, as well as recent decisions dealing with those principles before voting.

- The Redacted Minutes reveal a range of views among the Council Members, as was also reflected in the Summary Minutes. These views included concerns for the security and safety of athletes, issues related to anti-doping and testing procedures, and political concerns that Russia and Belarus were using “*sport as a weapon*”. This demonstrates that there was no single unified position within FIS Council.
- As there was no single unified position, and as FIS Council took into account the relevant considerations, being the scope of Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes and considered its application to the set of facts before it, there is no evidentiary basis for the Appellants’ speculative claim that the Appealed Decision was motivated exclusively by geopolitical considerations.
- No violation of the Olympic Charter and IOC instruments:
 - The Appellants rely on rules within the Olympic Charter that directly concern non-discrimination and political neutrality. As was noted during the meeting at which the Appealed Decision was adopted, the FIS Statutes contain similar wording to the Olympic Charter. To that end, the same arguments demonstrating that there was no violation of Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes are repeated to support the position that there was no violation of the Olympic Charter either.
 - The Appellants make no reference to Principle 5 of the Olympic Charter, which provides that:

“[Sports organisations] have the rights and obligations of autonomy, which include freely establishing and controlling the rules of sport, determining the structure and governance of their organisations”.
 - The Appellants also rely on the IOC Principles 2025 and the IOC Recommendations 2023 which the FIS Council considered in its deliberations. These are non-binding instruments that do not impose mandatory obligations on international federations, such as the Respondent, unless expressly incorporated into the international federations’ statutes or regulations.
 - The IOC Principles 2025 and the IOC Recommendations 2023 are expressly framed as guidance only. The introduction to the IOC Recommendations 2023 states:

“In this regard, the below Recommended Conditions of Participation have been produced in consultation with the IFs and international sports event organisers to provide guidance on the definition of neutral participation and its consistent implementation should an IF and/or international sports

event organiser decide, at its sole discretion and in accordance with its rules/statutes - also taking into account the IF's individual circumstances - to allow Russian and Belarusian athletes to return to international sports competitions. For the purposes of this document, "international sports competitions" refers to all IF events at any level".

- Moreover, there is no provision in the FIS Statutes that requires FIS Council to adhere to the IOC Principles 2025, the IOC Recommendations 2023, or any similar IOC instrument.
- As FIS Council was under no obligation to apply the IOC Principles 2025 or the IOC Recommendations 2023 and, pursuant to the express right of autonomy guaranteed by Principle 5 the Olympic Charter, that it was entitled to determine the governance of its organisation, there was no violation of the Olympic Charter or any IOC instrument.
- No unlawful departure from prior conduct:
 - The Respondent did not confirm that FIS Council's decisions of 1 March 2022 and 21 October 2025 were made on the basis of the IOC Recommendation 2022.
 - Instead, the Respondent stated that the 1 March 2022 decision was "*in line with the IOC recommendation dated 28 February 2022*".
 - Accordingly, there are no grounds for any allegation of unlawful departure from prior conduct.
- No breach of personality rights:
 - Failing to establish clear and objective AIN eligibility criteria does not breach personality rights, as the IOC Principles 2025 and IOC Recommendations are not binding on the FIS Council.
- The tripartite proportionality test is incompatible with secret ballot procedure:
 - The tripartite proportionality tests serves to explore the underlying rationale for a decision.
 - The Respondent is unable to speak for the reasons, rationale and considerations behind the individual FIS Council members' votes, as such matters are only known to individual Council members in circumstances where the vote was held by secret ballot.
 - The attempt to impose a tripartite proportionality test requiring the Respondent to demonstrate the legitimacy and non-discriminatory nature of the Appealed Decision is fundamentally incompatible with the secret ballot

procedure, permitted by the FIS Statutes, and which protects the FIS Council's members' ability to vote freely.

- No breach of the right to be heard or basic procedural rights:
 - The Appellants have not demonstrated why they should have had the right to participate in the decision-making process leading to the Appealed Decision, nor have they cited any provision in the FIS Statutes that confers such a right.
 - Being affected by the Appealed Decision alone does not establish an entitlement to be heard before the FIS Council renders a decision. As an international federation, the Respondent exercises its decision-making authority through its governing bodies, which inevitably impacts athletes and bodies such as the Appellants. By way of example, FIS Council has a responsibility to amend the Respondent's Calendar (Article 11.3.3.12 of the FIS Statutes).

V. JURISDICTION

30. The Appellants submitted that the CAS has jurisdiction pursuant to Articles R27 and R47 of the CAS Code and Article 15 of the FIS Statutes.

31. Article R27 of the CAS Code provides as follows:

“These Procedural Rules apply whenever the parties have agreed to refer a sports-related dispute to CAS. Such reference may arise out of an arbitration clause contained in a contract or regulations or by reason of a later arbitration agreement (ordinary arbitration proceedings) or may involve an appeal against a decision rendered by a federation, association or sports-related body where the statutes or regulations of such bodies, or a specific agreement provide for an appeal to CAS (appeal arbitration proceedings)”.

32. Article R47 of the CAS 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.

An appeal may be filed with CAS against an award rendered by CAS acting as a first instance tribunal if such appeal has been expressly provided by the rules of the federation or sports-body concerned”.

33. Article 15.1 of the FIS Statutes provides as follows:
- “Disputes between Member Associations or between a Member Association and FIS related to the Statutes and/or the FIS Rules and Regulations, which cannot satisfactorily be resolved within FIS, shall be decided by the Ordinary Division of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS). Any such decision shall be final and binding”.*
34. Article 15.7.1 of the FIS Statutes provides as follows:
- “Decisions of the Council and/or the President, which violate these Statutes and/or the Rules and Regulations or the law shall be subject to appeal to the Congress”.*
35. Article 15.7.6 of the FIS Statutes provides as follows:
- “Final decisions of the Congress, the Council (unless its decisions are subject to appeal to the Congress), the Ethics Committee and the Appeals Commission shall be subject to appeal to the CAS according to the Code of Sports-related Arbitration”.*
36. The Panel notes that the Respondent stated that whilst the FIS Statutes *“provide for an internal route of appeal through the FIS Congress”*, *“any decision taken by the FIS Congress would likely be appealed to the Court of Arbitration for Sport”*. Therefore, the Respondent proposed the alternative option of appealing to the CAS, available under Article 15.1 of the FIS Statutes, *“in the interest of all parties”*.
37. The CAS’s jurisdiction is not contested by the Respondent and all Parties fully participated in the hearing.
38. The Panel therefore concludes that the CAS has jurisdiction in the present matter.

VI. ADMISSIBILITY

39. Article R49 of the CAS 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 it if the statement of appeal is late. The Division President or the President of the Panel renders her/his decision after considering any submission made by the other parties”.*

40. Article R51 of the CAS Code provides as follows:

“Within ten days following the expiry of the time limit for the appeal, the Appellant shall file with the CAS Court Office a brief stating the facts and legal arguments giving rise to the appeal, together with all exhibits and specification of other evidence upon which it intends to rely. Alternatively, the Appellant shall inform the CAS Court Office in writing within the same time limit that the statement of appeal shall be considered as the appeal brief. The appeal shall be deemed to have been withdrawn if the Appellant fails to meet such time limit”.

41. The Panel notes that the Appealed Decision was adopted on 22 October 2025 and the Summary Minutes were published on 1 November 2025. The Statement of Appeal was filed on 11 November 2025, and thus within the 21-day time limit prescribed by Article R49 of the CAS Code. The Appeal Brief was filed on 20 November 2025, and thus within the 10-day time limit prescribed by Article R51 of the CAS Code.

42. The admissibility was not contested by the Respondent.

43. Accordingly, the present Appeal is admissible.

VII. APPLICABLE LAW

44. Article R58 of the CAS 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 the Panel deems appropriate. In the latter case, the Panel shall give reasons for its decision”.

45. The Appealed Decision was issued under the FIS Statutes. The Respondent is domiciled in Switzerland. Accordingly, pursuant to Article R58 of the Code, the FIS Statutes should apply as the primary applicable law to the present case. Swiss law will apply on a subsidiary basis.

VIII. MERITS

A. Scope of review

46. Pursuant to Article R57 of the CAS Code, “[t]he Panel has full power to review the facts and the law. It may issue a new decision which replaces the decision challenged or annul the decision and refer the case back to the previous instance”.

47. Whilst the Appellants have advanced multiple grounds of challenge in their written submissions and pleadings, including alleged violations of the Olympic Charter, the IOC Recommendations 2023, the IOC Principles 2025, personality rights under Swiss law, and the tripartite proportionality test, the Panel considers it appropriate to limit its review primarily to whether the Appealed Decision breaches Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes. This is for the following reasons:
- Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes constitutes the primary applicable regulation governing the Respondent's conduct. This provision expressly prohibits discrimination against individuals and requires the Respondent to conduct its activities in a politically neutral manner. Article 5.2 is a binding statutory rule that applies to the conduct of all the Respondent's bodies.
 - The Panel observes that many of the Appellants' other grounds of challenge are either derivative of, or subsumed within, the Article 5.2 analysis. Article 5.2 prohibits discrimination of any kind, reflecting the fundamental principle that finds expression both in the Olympic Charter, the IOC Recommendations 2023, the IOC Principles 2025, and personality rights under Swiss law. Accordingly, a determination under Article 5.2 essentially captures these other grounds of challenge too.
 - The tripartite proportionality test ordinarily serves as the analytical framework through which a discriminatory measure should be assessed once discrimination is established. However, in the present case, Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes imposes an objective obligation not to permit any form of discrimination. A breach of Article 5.2 arises where a decision, in its operation, produces a discriminatory effect, irrespective of whether discriminatory intent can be proven. Consequently, if a violation of Article 5.2 is established, it is not necessary to apply the tripartite proportionality test as a separate analytical exercise.
 - As was explained in case CAS 2022/A/8708, although a decision of a sports governing body will be afforded deference, "*CAS panels have and will consider evidence of violation of the relevant rules, statutes, and law de novo in determining whether a decision should stand*". To that end, the overarching task for the Panel is to determine whether the Appealed Decision violated the FIS Statutes.

B. Analysis of the Panel

48. Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes reads as follows:

FIS shall not allow any discrimination against national federations or individuals (competitors, officials, judges, delegates, etc.) on the grounds of race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, political affiliations, languages or abilities. FIS shall conduct its activities in a politically neutral manner.

49. The Appellants' principal arguments at the hearing on Article 5.2 were as follows:
- The Appealed Decision was discriminatory in both purpose and effect, adopted solely on the basis of an athlete's nationality, constituting "*unlawful and unjustified*" discrimination, in breach of Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes.
 - The confidential Minutes show a discussion dominated by geopolitical considerations entirely unrelated to the principles of Olympism or compliance with Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes.
 - The Respondent's position regarding the secret ballot voting system is "*untenable*", as a fundamentally unlawful and discriminatory decision cannot be overcome by virtue of the voting mechanism.
 - It is apparent that the Respondent acted *ultra vires* by adopting a measure that directly contravenes Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes, and this remains irrespective of how many members voted for it or under which internal procedure it was adopted.
50. The Respondent's principal arguments at the hearing on Article 5.2 were as follows:
- Any assessment of the Appealed Decision needs to have reference to its object, and not just to its effect. The Appellants' contention that the Appealed Decision was motivated by geopolitical considerations is without foundation.
 - FIS Council, comprising 22 members with diverse backgrounds and perspectives, could not have been expected to reach a unanimous position on such a contentious issue. There is no single view of FIS Council, and it is inappropriate and unfeasible to attempt to evaluate the individual reasoning of each member.
 - The secret ballot procedure enabled the FIS Council's members to vote without fear of "*backlash*" in the "*tight-knit*" skiing and snowboarding community, and was adopted lawfully. In the context of the Appealed Decision, the FIS Council acted within the bounds of its discretion, following lawful procedures, and no evidence indicates that the Appealed Decision was discriminatory in its object.
 - FIS Council was repeatedly "*reminded*" of its obligation to adhere to Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes, demonstrating that FIS Council was conscious of its statutory obligations, and the Appealed Decision was not motivated by discriminatory intent.

- Panel's questions:
 - The Panel asked whether, if the Respondent had complied with all procedural requirements, Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes would not mandate for any decision to comply with FIS Statutes' provisions. The Respondent replied that any decision must comply with Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes, but the assessment of whether a decision is discriminatory has to be decided by its object, not just its effect.
 - The Panel asked whether, given that the confidential Minutes record the FIS Council's members raising both potentially discriminatory and constructive points, the Respondent intended to suggest that the Appealed Decision would have been acceptable if no views were expressed, or that simply having a range of views validates the Appealed Decision. The Respondent stated that references to political concerns do not demonstrate that any individual member acted discriminatorily. A range of views were considered, and when political concerns arose, FIS Council was promptly reminded of Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes. The discussion of a few political viewpoints does not undermine the Appealed Decision, which was based on a reasoned deliberation addressing multiple objectives.

CAS case law

51. Over the course of their written submissions and pleadings on the assessment of compliance of the Appealed Decision with Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes, the Parties have referred to factual similarities between the present matter and several CAS cases, which the Panel summarizes below for ease of reference.
52. In CAS 96/001, US Swimming challenged the Fédération Internationale de Natation's ("FINA") decision to allow the substitution of an Irish athlete in the 400-metre freestyle event by the Irish National Olympic Committee ("NOC"), contending that the Irish NOC did not have the right to substitute the athlete and that FINA's decision was in violation of the FINA By-Laws. The Panel found that FINA's decision was not clearly prohibited by the applicable rules and that upholding the application would have had "*devastating*" consequences for the athlete. The application was rejected.
53. In CAS 96/153, an Australian athlete challenged the Australian Cycling Federation's ("ACF") decision to omit her as the nominated member of the Australian Olympic track team to compete in the 3000-metre women's individual event in the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta, contending that the ACF was bound to honour its written guarantee that she would be nominated for the event. The Panel found that the ACF failed to act fairly or with due regard to the interests of the Australian athlete. The Panel also determined that where a sporting organisation chooses to depart from its established selection rules and nominates, in advance, a particular athlete as its selected choice for a particular event, creating expectations in and obligations upon that individual,

it should be bound unless proper justification can be demonstrated for revoking its nomination. No such proper justification was found in this case. The Panel directed the ACF to nominate the appellant and set aside its nomination of a different Australian athlete.

54. In CAS 98/200, AEK Athens and SK Slavia Prague challenged the Union of European Football Association's ("UEFA") adoption of a rule on 19 May 1998, contending that the rule prevented commonly controlled clubs from participating in the same UEFA competition in violation of Swiss civil law, European Community ("EC") competition law and EC provisions on freedom of establishment and free movement of capital, and general principles of law. The Panel found that UEFA violated its duties of procedural fairness with respect to the 1998/99 season by adopting the contested rule too late, after the Cup Regulations had already been issued and clubs entitled to compete had been designated. However, the contested rule did not violate Swiss civil or competition law, EC competition law or EC provisions on freedom of establishment and free movement of capital, or general principles of law, as the rule was an "*essential feature*" for organising professional football competition, was proportionate to the legitimate objective of preventing conflicts of interest affecting the authenticity of results, and no viable less restrictive alternatives existed. The Panel partially upheld the application to extend indefinitely the interim stay ordered by the CAS on 16 July 1998 until the end of the 1999/2000 season, and permitted UEFA to implement its resolution of 19 May 1998 from the 2000/2001 season onwards.
55. In CAS 2022/A/8856, the Table Tennis Federation of Russia ("TTFR") challenged the European Table Tennis Union ("ETTU") Board of Appeal's decision of 26 April 2022, which upheld, in part, decisions of the ETTU Executive Board not to allow Belarusian and Russian players and officials to be invited or permitted in events hosted by ETTU, banned Russian clubs from competing in any European Club competitions for the 2021-2022 season, and prohibited Belarusian or Russian national symbols, flags or anthems to be displayed at ETTU events until further notice. The Panel found that the ETTU Executive Board enjoyed constitutional authority to act in respect of the urgent circumstances thrown up by the Russian-Ukraine war pursuant to Article 5.2.1.13 of the ETTU Constitution and took the decision by reference to its principles and objectives. However, the ETTU Executive Board decision was discriminatory, offending anti-discrimination provisions set forth in the ETTU Constitution and the IOC Charter. The ETTU Decision did not discharge its burden of proving that its decision was a measure of last resort and was necessary, reasonable and proportionate means of achieving a legitimate objective. The Panel partially upheld the appeal, setting aside the Executive Board decision, whilst upholding the decision that no Belarusian or Russian national symbols, flags or anthems were to be displayed during ETTU events until further notice.

Analysis and findings

56. Against this background, the Panel finds as follows.

57. First, the Panel notes that Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes contains two distinct but related obligations. Namely, (i) a prohibition on discrimination against national federations or individuals on specified grounds, and (ii) a requirement that the Respondent conduct its activities in a politically neutral manner. While Article 5.2 expressly refers to “*race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, political affiliations, languages or abilities*”, it does not expressly address nationality as a ground for discrimination. However, the Panel observes that “race” may include an individual’s nationality. This approach was adopted in CAS 2022/A/8856, which relied on Article 3 of the United Nations Declaration on Race and Racial Prejudice. In any event, a politically motivated nationality-based exclusion violates the “political neutrality” limb of Article 5.2 even if nationality were treated distinctly from race.
58. At the FIS Council Meeting held on 21 October 2025, the FIS Council was asked to decide whether athletes from Belarus should be allowed to compete as AINs, subject to strict adherence to the IOC eligibility criteria applicable to AIN participation. The specific question put to the FIS Council was whether to “*permit athletes from Belarus to participate as AIN in FIS qualification events for the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games in strict compliance with the IOC eligibility criteria for AIN, provided each NSA shall retain discretion to determine whether athletes from the concerned nations may take part in qualification events held within its jurisdiction*”. By voting against this proposal, the FIS Council declined to adopt a regime based on individualised assessment using neutral criteria, and instead opted for a measure that imposed a collective ban ostensibly based on an athlete’s nationality. There is no evidence in the case file that any of the Belarusian athletes expressed any political opinion in relation to the Russia-Ukraine conflict, or engaged in any conduct that would warrant sanction. Nor is there any suggestion that the Respondent reacted according to any such expression of opinion or individual conduct such that the exclusion could be characterised as objective and not discriminatory. The Panel considers that such an exclusion, irrespective of whether individual athletes might otherwise meet the IOC’s eligibility requirements applicable to AIN participation, constitutes a *prima facie* structural and systemic violation of Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes.
59. The present case is analogous to CAS 2022/A/8856. In that case, the Panel found that the ETTU’s decision “*to not invite or allow Belarusian and Russian players and officials in events hosted by ETTU*” was “*directed at the Appellant because it is Russian*”. The Panel in that case concluded that “*the ETTU EB Decision offended the anti-discrimination provisions set forth in the ETTU Constitution and the IOC Charter*” and was, therefore, discriminatory. The same conclusions must follow here. The Appealed Decision offends the anti-discrimination provisions set forth in Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes.
60. Second, the Respondent submitted, and argued at the hearing, that the Appealed Decision complied with the formal procedural requirements of the FIS Statutes. Namely, the Competency Condition, the Quorum Condition, and the Majority

Condition. The Panel finds, however, that that procedural validity does not automatically equate to substantive lawfulness.

61. This principle has been affirmed in CAS jurisprudence. In CAS 98/200, the Panel found that UEFA had “*violated its duties of procedural fairness*” by adopting the contested rule too late, after the Cup Regulations had already been issued and clubs entitled to compete had been designated. The significance of CAS 98/200 for present purposes is not confined to the particular procedural defect identified in that case, but lies in the Panel’s broader analytical approach. Specifically, the legality of a measure adopted by a sports governing body cannot be established merely by demonstrating that it was taken by the competent organ, with the requisite quorum, and by the requisite majority. Rather, CAS 98/200 illustrates that the validity of a decision must be assessed by reference to the entirety of the applicable legal framework, by reference not only to the formalities of its adoption but also to its conformity with the sports governing body’s own constitution and fundamental principles governing the exercise of its powers.
62. The Respondent’s reliance on the Competency, Quorum and Majority Condition is, at most, an answer to the question of whether FIS Council was empowered to adopt the Appealed Decision and whether it did so in a procedurally valid manner. It does not answer the separate, and more fundamental, question of whether the Appealed Decision was compatible with the FIS Statutes *per se*, and Article 5.2 in particular.
63. Third, the Respondent also submitted, and argued at the hearing, that FIS Council “*took into account the relevant considerations (being the scope of the relevant provision of the Statutes) and considered its application*”. However, the Panel finds that discussion of compliance with the FIS Statutes does not constitute compliance with the FIS Statutes.
64. The Summary Minutes record that “*the importance of following the FIS statutes were emphasised, and it was noted that Article 5.2 of the FIS statutes stipulate that the FIS activities shall be conducted in a politically neutral manner*”. The Panel accepts that this demonstrates that FIS Council was aware of Article 5.2 and its relevance. However, the Panel considers that this does not discharge the obligation set out in Article 5.2, which is framed as a duty to act in a politically neutral and non-discriminatory manner, and not merely a duty to consider political neutrality and non-discrimination principles. The question is, therefore, not whether Article 5.2 was reviewed, but whether the Appealed Decision was compatible with Article 5.2. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent cannot rely on the mere fact of having discussed Article 5.2 where the Appealed Decision is inconsistent with the substantive requirements imposed by that provision.
65. Fourth, the Respondent’s position that it “*is not able to comment on the rationale adopted by the majority of the Council Members*” because the vote was by secret ballot, and that “*there is no evidential basis for the Appellants to claim*” that the Appealed Decision was “*motivated exclusively by geopolitical considerations*”, is also

- unconvincing. Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes imposes an objective obligation not to permit any form of discrimination. Therefore, even if the subjective motivations of individual members of the FIS Council cannot be established, a breach of Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes nevertheless arises where the measure, in its operation, produces a discriminatory effect. The Appealed Decision violates Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes by reason of its discriminatory effect alone, irrespective of whether discriminatory intent can be proven.
66. This principle is well established in CAS jurisprudence. In CAS 2014/A/3759, the Panel held that the relevant regulations applying only to certain categories of athletes and imposing eligibility restrictions on those individuals were *prima facie* discriminatory, and proceeded to assess whether such discrimination could be justified without requiring proof of subjective intent. Likewise, in CAS 2018/O/5794 and CAS 2018/O/5798, the Panel found the relevant regulations to be *prima facie* discriminatory on the basis of legal sex and innate biological characteristics, and then examined whether such differential treatment was a necessary, reasonable and proportionate means of achieving a legitimate sporting objective. In each case, the analysis centred on the discriminatory effects of the eligibility rules and whether those effects could be justified by necessity, reasonableness and proportionality, rather than the motivations of the sporting body that adopted them.
67. Fifth, the Panel notes that the Respondent did not plead, either in its written submissions or at the hearing, that the Appealed Decision was necessary to preserve the safety of athletes or the integrity of competitions. The Respondent merely stated that the Redacted Minutes reveal a range of views among the Council Members, as was also reflected in the Summary Minutes. These views included concerns for the security and safety of athletes, issues related to anti-doping and testing procedures, and political concerns that Russia and Belarus were using “*sport as a weapon*”. This is material to the Article 5.2 analysis because the Respondent cannot show that the differential treatment in the Appealed Decision was based on an objective criteria capable of being within the scope of Article 5.2, rather than constituting unequal treatment based on nationality.
68. It follows that the Respondent’s letter of 4 November 2025 stated that FIS Council decision of 1 March 2022 was taken “*in line with the IOC recommendation dated 28th February 2022*” that no Russian or Belarusian athletes could participate in any of the Respondent’s competitions “*because organisers could not ensure the safety and security of all athletes*”. However, critically, the Respondent did not state that the Appealed Decision of 21 October 2025 was taken for the same reasons. To the contrary, the Summary Minutes demonstrate that the circumstances in October 2025 were materially different from those in February/March 2022. The Summary Minutes record that “*recent developments were discussed, including the IPC’s removal of its ban on Russian and Belarusian athletes, and a tribunal decision in bobsleigh finding that excluding neutral athletes is discriminatory*”. These developments indicate that, by October 2025, the international sporting community had moved towards permitting

Russian and Belarusian athletes to compete as AINs, subject to compliance with objective eligibility criteria, and that blanket bans were being found to be discriminatory. The Summary Minutes also record that “*the anti-doping program for Russian athletes was confirmed to have continued uninterrupted, with international agencies conducting testing to ensure compliance*”, which suggests that concerns about the integrity of anti-doping controls, which might have been a legitimate concern in March 2022, were no longer a basis for exclusion by October 2025.

Conclusion

69. In light of the foregoing, the Panel finds that the Appealed Decision is set aside insofar as it prohibits Belarusian athletes who satisfy the criteria established by the International Olympic Committee for participation as AIN at the 2026 Winter Olympic Games from competing at competitions and qualification events recognised by the Respondent.
70. The Panel emphasises that this ruling is based on the specific context, facts and circumstances of this case. It arises from the *prima facie* exclusion of athletes based on their nationality, regardless of whether the excluded athletes would have satisfied IOC eligibility criteria for AINs. The ruling is, therefore, without prejudice to any future cases where facts and circumstances may differ.
71. Finally, the Panel refrained from ordering the Respondent to take a specific action requested by the Appellants under paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of their requests for relief. The Panel determined such an order to be beyond its remit under the applicable law. Article R57 of the CAS Code provides that the Panel may “*issue a new decision which replaces the decision challenged or annul the decision and refer back to the previous instance*”. Whilst this provision confers broad powers on CAS panels, it does not empower a panel to dictate the precise manner in which a sports governing body must exercise its regulatory and administrative functions going forward. The requests in paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of the Appellants’ relief seek orders that would require the Respondent to establish, implement and apply specific criteria and assessments. Such orders would amount to the Panel prescribing in detail how the Respondent must exercise its decision-making discretion in future cases, rather than determining the lawfulness of the Appealed Decision. That would go beyond the function contemplated by Article R57 of the CAS Code. In these circumstances, the Panel confines itself to determining whether the Appealed Decision complies with Article 5.2 of the FIS Statutes, leaving the Respondent to determine the measures necessary to ensure compliance. Nonetheless, the Panel considers that this ruling provides the Respondent with sufficient indication of how to comply with Article 5.2 of the Respondent’s Statutes and to ensure the participation of eligible athletes as AINs.

IX. COSTS

(...)

ON THESE GROUNDS

The Court of Arbitration for Sport rules that:

1. The appeal filed by the Belarusian Ski Union, Ms. Hanna Huskova, Ms. Anna Derugo, Ms. Anastasiya Andryianava, Mr. Ihar Drabiankou, and Mr. Uladzislau Vazniuk with respect to the resolution issued by the International Ski & Snowboard Federation Council on 21 October 2025 is partially upheld.
2. The resolution issued by the International Ski & Snowboard Federation Council on 21 October 2025 is set aside insofar as it prohibits from competing at competitions and qualification events recognized by the International Ski & Snowboard Federation the Belarusian athletes who satisfy the criteria established by the International Olympic Committee for participation as individual neutral athletes (AIN) at the 2026 Milano-Cortina Winter Olympic Games.
3. (...).
4. (...).
5. All other motions or prayers for relief are dismissed.

Seat of arbitration: Lausanne, Switzerland

Date: 23 February 2026
(Operative part issued on 2 December 2025)

THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT

Vladimir Novak
President of the Panel

Siarhei Ilyich
Arbitrator

His Hon. James Robert Reid KC
Arbitrator