



TAS / CAS

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

COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT (CAS)

Ad Hoc Division – The XXV Olympic Winter Games in Milano-Cortina

CAS OG 26/08

sitting in the following composition:

President: Prof. Stefano Bastianon, Professor of Law in Bergamo, Italy, and
Attorney-at-law in Busto Arsizio, Italy

Arbitrators: Ms Marianne Saroli, Attorney-at-law in Montreal, Canada
Dr Isabelle Fellrath, Attorney-at-law in Morges, Switzerland

AWARD

in the arbitration between

Mr Raimo Reinsalu

Represented by Mr Olavs Cers and Mr Jānis Jurkāns, Attorney-at-law, Law Firm
CersJurkāns, Riga, Latvia

("Applicant")

v.

International Skating Union

Represented by Prof Dr Michael Geistlinger, Legal Advisor

("Respondent")

and

Lithuanian Olympic Committee

Ms Meda Variakojsytė

Represented by Mr Vaidas Variakojis, Lithuania

International Olympic Committee

Represented by Mr Antonio Rigozzi and Mr Patrick Pithon, Attorneys-at-law, LKK
Arbitration Ltd., Geneva, Switzerland

("Interested Parties")

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

I. PARTIES

1. The Applicant, Mr Raimo Reinsalu, is an International Skating Union Technical Specialist and a figure skating coach responsible for the preparation of the Lithuanian Olympic figure skater Ms Meda Variakojytė for the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games.
2. The Respondent, International Skating Union ("ISU"), is the international organization that administers the sports of ice skating, having its headquarters in Lausanne, Switzerland.
3. The interested parties are:
 - Lithuanian Olympic Committee, having its headquarters in Vilnius, Lithuania.
 - Ms Meda Variakojytė, a Lithuanian figure skater.
 - International Olympic Committee ("IOC"), which is the organisation responsible for the Olympic movement having its headquarters in Lausanne, Switzerland

II. FACTS

4. Below is a summary of the relevant facts and allegations based on the Parties' written and oral submissions, pleadings and evidence adduced during these proceedings including at the hearing held on 11 February 2026. Additional facts and allegations may be set out, where relevant, in connection with the legal discussion 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 considers necessary to explain its reasoning.

A. BACKGROUND FACTS

5. On 15 July 2025, the ISU Safeguarding received a complaint from a female Latvian figure skater, Ms X (identity known to the Panel, but deliberately redacted), alleging prolonged physical, psychological, and emotional abuse by her former coach, the Applicant, and his wife.
6. Following an initial interview on 17 July 2025, the ISU engaged Sportradar AG to conduct investigations into the allegations.
7. On 22 September 2025 and 7 October 2025, the Applicant submitted written responses to the ISU categorically denying all allegations. The Applicant characterized Ms X as a difficult athlete with documented mental health issues and asserted that any disciplinary measures taken were professionally appropriate responses to behavioral problems.

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

8. On 27 December 2025, Ms X submitted a signed witness statement to the ISU detailing her allegations and stating that she had been diagnosed with C-PTSD and Borderline Personality Disorder and had been hospitalized for psychiatric treatment from August to October 2025.
9. On 26 January 2026, Sportradar reported that Ms X had informed them that a criminal investigation had been initiated by Latvian police. On 3 February 2026, the ISU allegedly received confirmation from the Latvian and Lithuanian Olympic Committees that police investigations had been launched in Latvia.
10. On 2 February 2026, the Applicant submitted a further statement denying all allegations and disputing the existence of criminal proceedings against him in Latvia.
11. On or about 6 February 2026, the ISU submitted a Statement of Complaint against the Applicant to the ISU Disciplinary Commission alleging violations of Articles 3 and 6.1 of the ISU Code of Ethics and requesting provisional suspension from all ISU activities, including the OWG 2026.
12. As of 6 February 2026, the ISU initiated disciplinary proceedings against the Applicant on the basis of the alleged harassment and physical as well as psychological abuse committed by the Applicant against a Latvian figure skater, Ms X, who was a minor at the relevant time, from 2020 until May 2024.
13. By Order No. 1, dated 7 February 2026, the ISU Disciplinary Commission inter alia provisionally suspended the Applicant "from participation in *all ISU activities and events including the skating events at the Milano-Cortina Olympic Winter Games from 7 February 2026 until the final decision[...]*" (ground 5, original emphasis).
14. On 7 February 2026, the Applicant filed an urgent application for revocation of the provisional suspension with the ISU Disciplinary Commission.
15. On 8 February 2026, the ISU filed a statement of reply requesting the ISU Disciplinary Commission to dismiss the Applicant's urgent application for revocation of provisional suspension.
16. On 8 February 2026, the Applicant filed a reply to ISU's statement of reply requesting the ISU Disciplinary Commission, inter alia, to (a) grant the urgent application; (b) revoke the provisional disqualification imposed on 7 February 2026 concerning the provisional disqualification from participation in the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games; and (c) allow Mr Reinsalu to participate in the Olympic Games in the capacity in which he was delegated, pending a final decision on the merits of the disciplinary proceedings.
17. By decision dated 8 February 2026 (the "Appealed Decision"), the ISU Disciplinary Commission, inter alia, dismissed the Applicant's urgent application and upheld the provisional suspension. In finding against the Applicant, the ISU Disciplinary Committee argued that (a) the provisional suspension "is

considered to be necessary due to the seriousness of the allegations, whilst respecting the Alleged Offender's presumption of innocence and right to be heard (...)" ; and (b) the Winter Olympic Games "are the pinnacle event for participants, and the protection and safety of the participating athletes is of the highest priority. The DC has taken urgent provisional measures, being the provisional suspension of Mr Reinsalu as necessary due to potential risk to the athletes following these serious allegations against Mr Reinsalu. The principle of proportionality is respected".

18. On 9 February 2026, the Lithuanian Olympic Committee cancelled the Applicant's accreditation.

III. THE CAS PROCEEDINGS

19. On 9 February 2026, at 7:32 (time of Milan) the Applicant filed an Application with the CAS ad Hoc Division against the Respondent to challenge the Appealed Decision, mentioning the Lithuanian Olympic Committee, Ms Meda Variakojsytė as interested parties. The IOC is also an interested party to this procedure.
20. On 9 February 2026, the CAS Ad Hoc Division notified the Application to the Respondent, to the interested parties and to the IOC.
21. On 9 February 2026, the CAS Ad Hoc Division notified the Parties of composition of the Arbitral Tribunal:

President: Prof. Stefano Bastianon, Professor of Law in Bergamo, Italy, and Attorney-at-law in Busto Arsizio, Italy

Arbitrators: Ms Marianne Saroli, Attorney-at-law in Montreal, Canada

Dr Isabelle Fellrath, Attorney-at-law in Morges, Switzerland
22. On 9 February 2026, the CAS Ad Hoc Division invited the Respondent to file its Reply to the Applicant's Application by 10 February 2026, at 17:00 (time of Milan) and informed the interested parties that they were entitled to file an *Amicus curiae* brief within the same time limit. The CAS Ad Hoc Division further summoned the Parties to appear before the Panel of the CAS Ad Hoc Division on 11 February 2026 at 14:00 (time of Milan).
23. On 9 February 2026, the Applicant filed a "*Submission on the addition of evidence*" arguing that: (a) "*Mr Reinsalu, through his legal counsel, Mr Olavs Cers, sent on 8 February 2026 at 12:46 (CET), that is several hours before the ISU Disciplinary Commission adopted its decision on the same day, a signed submission entitled 'Reply to ISU Statement of Reply as to Mr Reinsalu's Urgent Application for Revocation of Provisional Suspension'*" ; (b) "*this submission was transmitted to the ISU Disciplinary Commission and the ISU legal*

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

Department and was sent to all relevant and available e-mail addresses of the ISU involved in the proceedings"; (c) nevertheless, "by email dated 9 February 2026, at 09:16 (CET), Mr Michael Geislinger, ISU Legal Advisor, expressly confirmed that this submission was not taken into account by the ISU Disciplinary Commission, asserting that it allegedly arrived after the decision had been taken and that it was considered 'unsolicited'".

24. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that this position is factually incorrect and legally untenable, as the submission was sent several hours before the decision was adopted and within an ongoing procedure in which the ISU itself had been allowed to file a reply. Therefore, *"disregarding the Applicant's submission on purely formal grounds in such circumstances constitutes a clear breach of the right to be heard and of the principle of equality of arms"*.
25. On 10 February 2026, the Respondent filed its Reply.
26. On 10 February 2026, Ms Meda Variakojytė filed her observations as Interested Party.
27. On 10 February 2026, the IOC filed its *Amicus Curiae* brief as Interested Party.
28. On 11 February 2026 at 14:00 (time of Milan), a hearing was held at the office of the CAS ad hoc Division in Milan, Italy, with the participation of the following persons, in addition to the Panel, Mr Antonio de Quesada, Head of Arbitration of the CAS and Mr Andrés Redondo, CAS Counsel:

For the Applicant:

- Mr Raimo Reinsalu (via videoconference)
- Mr Jānis Jurkāns – Counsel (via videoconference)

For the Respondent:

- Ms Susan Petricevic - Chair of the ISU Disciplinary Commission (in person)
- Mr Tiago Luduvig - General Counsel (in person)
- Mr Michael Geistlinger - ISU Legal Advisor (in person)

For the IOC:

- Mr Antonio Rigozzi – Counsel (in person)

For Ms Meda Variakojytė:

- Mr Vaidas Variakojis – Father of Ms Meda Variakojytė (via videoconference), assisted by a translator

29. At the hearing, the Parties confirmed that they had no objections to the composition of the Panel. Each Party was afforded the opportunity to present its arguments on the merits of the case.
30. Before the hearing was concluded, the Parties expressly stated that they did not have any objection to the procedure adopted and how the proceeding was conducted by the Panel and confirmed that their right to be heard and to be treated equally was respected.

IV. THE PARTIES' SUBMISSIONS AND REQUESTS FOR RELIEF

A. THE APPELLANT

31. In his Application, the Applicant requested the following reliefs:

"1) Annul the Decision of the ISU Disciplinary Commission dated 8 February 2026 insofar as it maintains the provisional suspension in relation to the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games;

2) Order the immediate lifting of the provisional suspension with respect to Mr Raimo Reinsalu's participation in the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games;

3) Grant any other relief the Panel deems appropriate to safeguard the Applicant's rights".

32. Moreover, the Applicant requested, as "extremely urgent interim relief", a stay of the Appealed Decision.

33. In supporting his requests for relief, the Applicant relied on the following main arguments:

(a) Mr Reinsalu categorically denies all allegations raised against him.

(b) Notwithstanding the absence of any determination on the merits and before the Applicant has been afforded a genuine opportunity to present his defence, the ISU has created an exceptionally dangerous and irreversible situation by imposing a provisional suspension at the very moment of the Olympic Games.

(c) The timing of the Appealed Decision, adopted after the opening of the Games, when Mr Reinsalu had already been designated as part of the Lithuanian delegation, deprived the Lithuanian Olympic Team and Ms Meda Variakoitytė of the support of her long-standing coach at the most critical moment of her sporting career, causing significant stress and emotional pressure on the athlete.

(d) There is no factual basis for the assumption that the Applicant poses any risk to Ms Meda Variakoitytė. Moreover, the athlete has publicly expressed her support for the Applicant and both the athlete, and her father have explicitly

informed the Lithuanian Olympic Committee that they have no objection to his presence at the Olympic Games or to his role in supporting her during the competition.

(e) The Appealed Decision violates fundamental principles of due process and the presumption of innocence in so far as it requires the Applicant to prove that the psychiatric condition of Ms X was not caused by the Applicant's alleged conduct, thereby unlawfully shifting the burden of proof on the Applicant.

(f) The imposed restrictive measure cannot be regarded as a genuine provisional protective measure. In substance, it constitutes a sanction given that it deprives the Applicant of participation in a unique and non-repeatable Olympic event and produces irreversible consequences that cannot be remedied even in the event of full exoneration.

(g) If the provisional suspension is not stayed, the arbitration proceedings before the CAS Ad Hoc Division will be rendered ineffective, as the Olympic games will proceed and conclude before any meaningful relief can be granted.

B. THE RESPONDENT

34. In its Reply, the Respondent requested the following reliefs:

"To dismiss the Application of Mr Reinsalu, including any and all Supplements".

35. In supporting its requests for relief, the Respondent relied on the following main arguments:

(a) CAS has no jurisdiction to decide on the Applicant's Application, given that the provisional suspension imposed by the ISU Disciplinary Commission is not a dispute and it did not arise in the relevant timeframe. In particular, the Respondent submits that (i) in the case at hand there is a dispute concerning the imposition of the provisional suspension; (ii) the dispute arose on 22 September 2025 when the Applicant sent an email to the ISU General Counsel *"in connection with the complaint submitted by the Latvian skater Ms X against me personally and our club Kristal Ice"*; (iii) the dispute is a disagreement on point of facts and the whole period until submission of a Statement of Complaint to the ISU Disciplinary Commission is to be seen as effort to establish the true facts.

(b) Moreover, the Respondent argues that the provisional suspension cannot be considered as a dispute allowing the jurisdiction of CAS, given that:

(i) according to Article 40(1) of the ISU Constitution CAS is competent to hear appeals against final decisions passed by the ISU and its bodies;

(ii) pursuant to Article 16(1) of the ISU Disciplinary Procedures a "Final Decision" is defined as follows:

"1) The proceedings before the DC shall be considered terminated:

a) when the DC issues an Order of Termination according to Article 1 Hereof;

b) when the DC Chair dismisses the matter according to Article 1 hereof;

c) when the Complaint is withdrawn by the Claimant or the ISU and the other party agrees with the withdrawal; or

d) when the Panel issues its Final Decision based on the merits of the Complaint”:

(iii) the decision of the ISU Disciplinary Commission on provisional suspension does not terminate the proceedings which remain ongoing and, therefore, it cannot be considered as Final Decision pursuant to Article 16(1) of the ISU Disciplinary Procedures.

(c) The ISU would have suffered irreparable harm if the provisional suspension of the Applicant had not been granted. According to CAS jurisprudence, irreparable harm means “*substantial harm or risks that would be impossible to remedy at a later stage*” (see OG 22/008 & 22/009 & 22/010, at para 207 with reference to earlier decisions). Any abuse cannot be remedied, it violates the psyche of a person and remains throughout their life. The ISU is responsible for its skaters and its sport: it cannot tolerate any danger of harassment or abuse in violation of its Code of Ethics. The credibility of the ISU and its principles of good governance would be irreparably damaged.

(d) The ISU has been cautious in collecting evidence and verifying statements and media reports so that a solid basis could be established which enables a success on the merits. It is more likely than not that the ISU will be successful on such merits - the fact that the ISU Disciplinary Commission upheld its decision irrespective of the Applicant’s request for revocation strengthens the likelihood of the ISU’s success on the merits.

(e) The ISU balanced the interests of the ISU against those of Mr Reinsalu and his skater. The ISU Disciplinary Commission allowed for a review of its decision and thus, gave the Appellant the chance of using a remedy which is neither foreseen by the ISU Constitution 2025 nor by the ISU Disciplinary Procedures. Even, if there are also allegations against Ms Kovalkova, the wife of Mr Reinsalu, the ISU abstained from submitting a Statement of Complaint against her prior to the Milano – Cortina 2026 Olympics Winter Games in the interests of the two skaters. Since Ms Kovalkova has been listed as coach for both skaters, any possible adverse effect on the two skaters could be avoided (Mr Kuliss) or minimised (Ms Variakojytė). The ISU has been informed by the Lithuanian Olympic Committee that a person from the Lithuanian Skating Federation (Figure) will be with the skater at the Olympic Games and will take care of her. She has an effective chance for fair and equal treatment with other skaters. Thus, also in her case the interest of the ISU to avoid any case of harassment and abuse outweighs the interests of the skater.

(f) The substitution of Mr Reinsalu's coaching by a member of the Lithuanian Figure Skating Federation means that he would not be visible in Milan. Good results of his skater(s) will be his merits even if he was not present in person at the Olympic Games. His reputation and career will not suffer from the fact that he did not participate at the Olympic Games. Thus, in his case, too, the ISU's interests creating a safe environment for his skater and other skaters outweighs his interests in participating at the Olympic Games.

(g) The Applicant's argument alleging a violation of the right to a fair hearing and to be heard is unfounded. In particular:

(i) the ISU informed the Latvian Skating Federation on the start of its investigations and asked its president to maintain confidentiality;

(ii) irrespective of this request, the Applicant soon thereafter provided the ISU with his view of the facts and his arguments;

(iii) the ISU did not hide these unsolicited statements and explanations of the Applicant from the Disciplinary Commission nor from the CAS Panel, but included them in full into the ISU's Statement of Complaint and its Reply to CAS;

(iv) when dealing with the ISU's request for imposition of a provisional suspension the Disciplinary Commission also had the counterarguments and defence of the Applicant at its disposal and for its consideration. Thus, all arguments and defence of the Applicant, as brought forward, could and have been considered. The Applicant has been heard, he has been dealt with fairly and with due respect of his procedural rights. If there are any procedural issues, quod non, there is the chance that they will be cured by the CAS proceedings;

(v) the misfortune that the Applicant's Reply to the ISU's Reply because of a system failure did not reach the ISU Disciplinary Commission early enough for consideration did not create any damage to Mr Reinsalu. The arguments as to the skater had been considered by the ISU before their submission.

C. Ms MEDA VARIKOJYTĖ

36. In his written submissions filed on behalf of Ms Meda Variakojytė, her father Mr Vaidas Variakojis requested *"the interests of the athlete be duly taken into account"* and that *"that Meda Variakojytė be allowed to compete at the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games together with her coach, Mr Raimo Reinsalu – the person she trusts, with whom she has worked for many years, and who constitutes an integral part of her sporting development and Olympic preparation"*.

37. In supporting his requests for relief, Mr Vaidas Variakojis relied on the following main arguments:

(a) The Appealed Decision is manifestly disproportionate and effectively directed against Ms Meda Variakojytė, depriving her of the possibility to prepare for and compete in the most important event of her sporting career under fair and normal conditions.

(b) Meda Variakojytė has been training at the Kristal Ice sports club under the guidance of Mr Raimo Reinsalu since 2019, that is, since the age of twelve. Throughout all these years, I have personally supported her sporting career: I took her to training sessions, observed the training process, travelled with her to competitions and remained in constant contact with both my daughter and her coach. For the vast majority of this time, Meda was trained directly by Mr Reinsalu, who invested an extraordinary amount of professional effort and personal commitment to enable her to qualify for the Olympic Games.

(c) Meda Variakojytė has always been under my close supervision, and we maintain open and trusting communication. She speaks to me freely about her experiences, emotions and challenges in sport. If there had ever been any form of violence, inappropriate behaviour or misconduct by Mr Reinsalu, I would certainly have been aware of it, and any cooperation with him would have been immediately terminated. No such situation has ever occurred.

(d) Due to the unlawful decision of the ISU Disciplinary Commission, the preparation process for the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games has been severely disrupted, making it impossible for Meda Variakojytė to continue her training in a proper and effective manner.

(e) Most importantly, preparing for the Olympic Games without the presence of her long-standing coach causes Meda Variakojytė significant psychological distress. This situation endangers not only her sporting preparation, but also her mental well-being at the most critical moment of her career.

D. THE IOC

38. In its *Amicus Curiae* brief, the IOC observed that, notwithstanding the Applicant bases the CAS jurisdiction in the arbitration clause inserted in the official entry form for the Olympic Games, the case file does not contain any such entry form signed by the Applicant.
39. However, the IOC acknowledges that on 20 October 2025 the Applicant did sign the “Conditions of Participation for NOC Delegation Members” for the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games containing a CAS arbitration clause.
40. On the merits, the IOC made no submission, given that “*the present matter concerns a decision taken by the ISU Disciplinary Commission to provisionally suspend the Applicant following disciplinary proceedings initiated by the ISU and, as such, is a matter between the Applicant and the ISU*”.

V. JURISDICTION AND ADMISSIBILITY

41. Rule 61 [*"Dispute Resolution"*] of the Olympic Charter ("OC") provides as follows:

"1 (...)

2. Any dispute arising on the occasion of, or in connection with, the Olympic Games shall be submitted exclusively to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), in accordance with the Code of Sports-Related Arbitration".

42. Article 1 [*"Application of the Present Rules and Jurisdiction of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS)"*] of the CAS Arbitration Rules for the Olympic Games ("CAS Ad Hoc Rules") provides as follows:

"The purpose of the present Rules is to provide, in the interests of the athletes and of sport, for the resolution by arbitration of any disputes covered by Rule 61 of the Olympic Charter, insofar as they arise during the Olympic Games or during a period of ten days preceding the Opening Ceremony of the Olympic Games.

In the case of a request for arbitration against a decision pronounced by the IOC, an NOC, an International Federation or an Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, the claimant must, before filing such request, have exhausted all the internal remedies available to him/her pursuant to the statutes or regulations of the sports body concerned, unless the time needed to exhaust the internal remedies would make the appeal to the CAS Ad Hoc Division ineffective."

43. As consistently held in CAS jurisprudence (e.g. CAS OG 22/02, reaffirmed in CAS OG 26/01, OG 26/02 and OG 26/03), the jurisdiction of the CAS Ad Hoc Division is limited. Jurisdiction exists only where the cumulative requirements set out in Article 1 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules are satisfied. In particular, the dispute submitted to the Panel must:

(a) arise on the occasion of, or in connection with, the Olympic Games within the meaning of Rule 61.2 of the OC;

(b) arise during the Olympic Games or within the ten-day period preceding the Opening Ceremony;

(c) where the request is directed against a decision of a sports body, either follow the exhaustion of available internal remedies or fall within the exception provided in Article 1 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules where the time required to exhaust such remedies would render recourse to the CAS Ad Hoc Division ineffective.

A. JURISDICTION *RATIONE MATERIAE*

44. The Panel notes that the Applicant has requested the CAS ad Hoc Division (a) to annul the decision of the ISU Disciplinary Commission dated 8 February 2026 *“insofar as it maintains the provisional suspension in relation to the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games”*; (b) to order the immediate lifting of the provisional suspension with respect to the Applicant’s *“participation in the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games”*; and (c) *“to grant any other relief the Panel deems appropriate to safeguard the Applicant’s rights”*. Moreover, the Applicant requested a stay of the execution of the Appealed Decision..
45. In the present case, the Panel is satisfied that the dispute is about whether or not the provisional suspension imposed on the Applicant by Order No. 1 of the ISU Disciplinary Commission dated 7 February 2026 and confirmed by the Appealed Decision should be provisionally stayed and eventually set aside. As such, it is uncontested that the dispute is directly connected with the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games, since the outcome of the dispute is relevant for the Applicant’s further participation in the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games (see e.g. CAS OG 22/008 & 22/009 & 22/010, Para. 156).

B. JURISDICTION *RATIONE TEMPORIS*

46. The Panel notes that it is uncontested that the dispute, pertaining to the provisional suspension imposed on the Applicant proceeds from the Appealed Decision which was itself rendered during the period considered to be relevant under Article 1 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules, i.e. during the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games. In this respect, it is irrelevant whether the facts otherwise underlying the Appealed Decision have arisen at a previous stage (CAS OG 22/008 & 22/009 & 22/010, Para. 162; CAS OG 26/03).

C. EXHAUSTION OF INTERNAL REMEDIES

47. Where a request for arbitration is directed against a decision of an International Federation, Article 1 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules requires exhaustion of available internal remedies, unless the time required to exhaust such remedies would make recourse to the CAS Ad Hoc Division ineffective.
48. The requirement to exhaust internal remedies serves important purposes, including respect for the autonomy of sports governing bodies and affording them the opportunity to resolve disputes internally in the first instance.
49. That requirement is, however, expressly subject to an exception where *“the time needed to exhaust the internal remedies would make the appeal to the CAS Ad Hoc Division ineffective”*. This exception reflects the specific function of the CAS Ad Hoc Division, namely, to provide urgent and effective dispute resolution during the Olympic Games period, when ordinary appeal timelines are incompatible with competition schedules.

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

50. In the present case, the Appealed Decision explicitly acknowledged that "*there is no other internal remedy available to Mr Reinsalu regarding the ISU DC's provisional suspension*", and in effect ISU Constitution 2024 art. 26(1) and (2)(a) provides that "decisions of the DC, and of the Council when allowed by explicit provision of this Constitution, may be filed with the Appeals Arbitration Division of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS)". For the sake of completeness, it is irrelevant for the purpose of ascertaining CAS Ad Hoc Division jurisdiction whether, as per the applicable internal rules, the Appealed Decision qualifies as interim or final ruling from the perspective of internal review mechanism.

D. CONCLUSION

51. In light of the foregoing, and given the circumstances of the present case, the Panel finds that it has jurisdiction to hear this dispute, and that the application is otherwise admissible.

VI. APPLICABLE LAW

52. Under art. 17 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules, the Panel shall decide the dispute "*pursuant to the Olympic Charter, the applicable regulations, general principles of law and the rules of law, the application of which it deems appropriate.*"
53. The Panel notes that the "applicable regulations" in this case are the ISU Rules and Regulations.

VII. DISCUSSION

A. LEGAL FRAMEWORK

54. These proceedings are governed by the CAS Ad Hoc Rules enacted by the International Council of Arbitration for Sport ("ICAS") on 14 October 2003 (amended on 8 July 2021). They are further governed by Chapter 12 of the Swiss Private International Law Act of 18 December 1987 ("PILA"). The PILA applies to this arbitration as a result of the express choice of law contained in Article 7 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules and as the result of the choice of Lausanne, Switzerland as the seat of the CAS Ad Hoc Division and of the Panel, pursuant to Article 7 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules.
55. According to Article 16 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules, the Panel has "*full power to establish the facts on which the application is based*".

B. MERITS

56. In his Application, the Applicant submits that the ISU has imposed "*a provisional suspension at the very moment of the Olympic Games*", notwithstanding the absence of any determination on the merits of the Applicant's alleged

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

misconduct in order to ensure that its effects would be maximal and irreversible. He further argues that the alleged need to protect Ms Meda Variakojtė is purely speculative and not supported by any concrete or specific evidence. Lastly, he argues that the provisional suspension also violates due process and the presumption of innocence, given that it is based on the Applicant's alleged failure to prove that the psychiatric condition of Ms X was not caused by his alleged misconduct. Accordingly, if the Applicant is not allowed to remain with and support his Olympic athlete, Ms Meda Variakojtė, during the Milano-Cortina 2026 Olympic Winter Games, this would undermine the principles of fair play, equality of arms and sporting integrity.

57. By contrast, the Respondent submits that the ISU would have suffered irreparable harm if the provisional suspension of the Applicant had not been granted, given that any abuse cannot be remedied, it violates the psyche of a person and remains throughout their life. Moreover, the ISU is responsible for its Skaters and its sport and therefore it cannot tolerate any danger of harassment or abuse in violation of its Code of Ethics. The Respondent also argues that the Applicant's reputation and career will not suffer from the fact that he did not participate at the Olympic Games, whereas the ISU's interests creating a safe environment for his Skater and other skaters outweighs his interests in participating at the Olympic Games. Lastly, the Respondent argues that there was no violation of the right to a fair hearing and the right of defence during the disciplinary proceedings against the Applicant, which are still ongoing.
58. The Panel notes that, according to Article 4(5) of the ISU Disciplinary Procedures, "[t]he Panel may order any provisional measures as it may deem appropriate according to the circumstances. In the case of urgency, the Chair may order any such provisional measures".
59. Moreover, Article 6(1) of the ISU Code of Ethics provides as follows: "[p]ersons subject to this Code of Ethics shall refrain from all forms of harassment and abuse, be it sexual, physical or psychological, whether occurring in isolation or in combination or whether consisting of a one-off incident or a series of incidents, whether done in person or online, (including but not limited to social media) and in particular from any abuse of authority, i.e. the improper use of a position of influence, power or authority over another person. Abuse can also take the form of neglect or negligence".
60. Lastly, Article 2 of the ISU Code of Ethics provides that "[s]ubject to this Code of Ethics are all persons who involve themselves with the ISU in any capacity, claiming or seeking standing as current or prospective participants in any ISU Event or activity, in particular but not limited to all ISU Office Holders, ISU Officials, ISU Members (and their members when participating in an ISU Event or activity), ISU employees and consultants, Organizing Committees for ISU Events and their Officials and volunteers, Skaters, Coaches, doctors, team leaders, and any other Athlete Support Personnel¹ as well as any other persons who engage in any conduct or activity in relation to the ISU".

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

61. The present matter concerns a provisional suspension imposed not on an athlete, but on a coach against whom allegations of breaches of the ISU Code of Ethics, in particular with regard to alleged abuse, have been formally raised.
62. The Panel recalls at the outset that a provisional suspension constitutes a precautionary and protective measure, and not a disciplinary sanction. Its function is not to anticipate the outcome of the proceedings on the merits or to imply any presumption of guilt, but to safeguard the integrity of the sport, the welfare of participants, and the proper functioning of the sporting environment pending a final determination.
63. This protective rationale carries particular weight in cases involving allegations of abuse. The ISU Code of Ethics is designed, *inter alia*, to ensure the safety, dignity and well-being of athletes and other participants, especially in relationships characterised by authority, trust and dependency. A coach occupies a position of significant authority and influence *vis-à-vis* athletes. Allegations of abuse therefore engage concerns that transcend mere regulatory compliance and directly implicate participant protection and welfare.
64. In light of the seriousness of the allegations, and without prejudging their ultimate merits, the Panel considers that the ISU Disciplinary Commission was entitled to conclude that maintaining the coach in active functions pending the outcome of the proceedings could pose risks incompatible with the preventive and protective objectives of the ISU Code of Ethics. The temporary removal from functions thus serves a legitimate and proportionate protective purpose.
65. As regards proportionality, the Panel emphasises that the balancing of interests must focus on the rights and interests directly affected by the provisional suspension — namely those of the suspended coach — weighed against the legitimate regulatory interest in protecting participants and preserving the integrity of the sporting environment. While potential indirect sporting, professional or organisational consequences for third parties, such as athletes coached by the Applicant, are relevant considerations, they cannot override the legitimate regulatory interest in protecting participants and preserving the integrity of the sporting environment where serious allegations of abuse have been raised.
66. While such indirect effects may be regrettable, they do not alter the legal nature of the measure nor the necessity of protective considerations. To hold otherwise would risk subordinating the preventive and protective objectives of the ISU Code of Ethics to contingent third-party interests, thereby undermining their effectiveness.
67. The Panel further recalls that, although it has full power of review, its task at this preliminary stage is not to determine whether the alleged violations have been conclusively established. Rather, it must assess whether the impugned decision was based on a sufficient *prima facie* foundation, pursued a legitimate objective, and complied with the principles of reasonableness and proportionality.

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

68. In matters involving allegations affecting participant welfare and integrity, governing bodies necessarily enjoy a margin of discretion in adopting preventive measures aimed at mitigating potential risks pending a final adjudication. Such discretion is inherent in the risk-prevention function of ethical and protective frameworks.
69. The relevant question is therefore not whether the alleged misconduct has already been proven, but whether, having regard to the gravity of the allegations and the position of authority held by the coach, the adoption of a temporary suspension falls within the bounds of that margin of discretion and can be regarded as reasonable and proportionate.
70. In light of (i) the seriousness of the allegations, (ii) the position of authority and trust occupied by the Applicant, and (iii) the preventive and protective function of the ISU Code of Ethics, the Panel concludes that the provisional suspension constitutes a reasonable, necessary and proportionate interim measure pending the final determination of the merits. This conclusion does not entail any prejudgment as to the Applicant's ultimate responsibility.
71. Moreover, the Panel does not consider the Applicant's reference to a presumption of innocence to be availing in the context of this Application. The Panel considers that a provisional suspension must be substantiated by more than speculation alone; yet a "reasonable possibility" that the Appellant committed the alleged violation is all that is required (CAS 2017/A/4968, Para. 175). What is more, the present Application concerns provisional measures, not a final sanction. Since there is no finding of guilt, the Panel does not consider a provisional suspension to implicate, still less violate, the Applicant's presumption of innocence.
72. In addition to the above, the Panel also notes that the athlete Meda Variakojytë will benefit from the assistance of an accredited coach for these Olympic Winter Games and therefore is not too much prejudiced by the provisional suspension of the Applicant.
73. Having carefully considered the Parties' submissions and the applicable regulatory framework, the Panel concludes that the provisional suspension was validly imposed in accordance with the relevant provisions. The conditions required for its imposition were satisfied, and the Panel finds no procedural or substantive defect that would justify its lifting or modification.
74. As regards the Applicant's due process concerns, the Panel makes the following observations. First, the Applicant was afforded an opportunity to contest the provisional suspension through an urgent application for revocation, which was decided by the ISU Disciplinary Commission on 8 February 2026 after considering his arguments. Second, provisional suspensions, by their nature, are imposed on a preliminary assessment of evidence without full adjudication of the merits. The standard is not proof beyond reasonable doubt, but whether there is a sufficient prima facie basis for protective measures. Third, the Applicant's contention that he was required to "prove" that Ms X's psychiatric

condition was not caused by his conduct mischaracterizes the burden of proof. The ISU Disciplinary Commission assessed whether the evidence before it, including medical records and witness statements, provided a reasonable basis for protective measures, not whether the Applicant had disproven causation. Fourth, the proceedings on the merits before the ISU Disciplinary Commission remain pending, and it is in those proceedings that the Applicant's substantive defense will be considered. The Panel has no reason to believe that the Applicant will not be afforded appropriate procedural safeguards in accordance with the ISU's regulations and general principles of procedural fairness. Fifth, should any procedural deficiencies arise, they can be remedied in those proceedings or, if necessary, on appeal to the CAS ordinary division following a final decision. In these circumstances, the Panel finds no violation of the Applicant's procedural rights in relation to the imposition of the provisional suspension.

75. In light of this finding, the Panel considers that it is not required to address the Applicant's request for a stay of the provisional suspension. Once the validity of the provisional suspension has been confirmed, any request seeking to suspend or stay its effects no longer retains an autonomous object. The Panel therefore deems such request to be devoid of purpose.

VIII. COSTS

76. According to Article 22 para. 1 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules, the services of the CAS ad hoc Division "*are free of charge*".
77. According to Article 22 para. 2 of the CAS Ad Hoc Rules, parties to CAS Ad Hoc proceedings "*shall pay their own costs of legal representation, experts, witnesses and interpreters*".
78. Consequently, there is no order as to costs.

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

DECISION

On these grounds, the Ad Hoc Division of the Court of Arbitration for Sport renders the following decision:

1. The Application filed by Mr Raimo Reinsalu against the decision of the ISU Disciplinary Commission dated 8 February 2026 is dismissed.
2. The Decision of the ISU Disciplinary Commission dated 8 February 2026 is upheld.
3. All other and further motions or prayers for relief are dismissed

Seat of arbitration: Lausanne
Date: 12 February 2026

THE AD HOC DIVISION OF THE COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT



Prof. Stefano Bastianon
President of the Panel



Marianne Saroli
Arbitrator



Isabelle Fellrath
Arbitrator