

**DECISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TENNIS INTEGRITY AGENCY
PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 7.14 OF THE 2025 TENNIS ANTI-DOPING PROGRAMME**

I. Introduction

1. The International Tennis Integrity Agency (**ITIA**) is the delegated third party, under the World Anti-Doping Code (**Code**), of the International Tennis Federation (**ITF**), the international governing body for the sport of tennis and signatory of the Code. Under the delegation, the ITIA is responsible for the management and administration of anti-doping across professional tennis in accordance with the Tennis Anti-Doping Programme (the **TADP** or the **Programme**), which sets out Code-compliant anti-doping rules applicable to players competing in Covered Events.
2. Alfredo Casso (the **Player**) is a 24-year-old tennis player from the United States. He has achieved a career-high ITF singles ranking of 1013. By virtue of (among other things) his ITF ranking and participation in Covered Events in 2025, the Player was bound by and required to comply with the TADP. He has been playing tennis at the professional level since 2017.
3. The ITIA charged the Player with the commission of anti-doping rule violations under Article 2.1 and/or Article 2.2 of the TADP (copied below), and proposed certain Consequences based on its analysis of the degree of fault that the Player bears for those violations:
 - “2.1 The presence of a Prohibited Substance or any of its Metabolites or Markers in a Player’s Sample, unless the Player establishes that such presence is consistent with a TUE granted in accordance with Article 4.4.”
 - “2.2 Use or Attempted Use by a Player of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method, unless the Player establishes that such Use or Attempted Use is consistent with a TUE granted in accordance with Article 4.4.”
4. The Player has admitted the anti-doping rule violations charged and acceded to the Consequences proposed by the ITIA.
5. In such circumstances, Article 7.14 of the 2025 TADP provides that:
 - “7.14.1 At any time prior to a final decision by the Independent Tribunal, the ITIA may invite the Player or other Person to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) asserted and accede to specified Consequences [...]
 - 7.14.2 In the event that the Player or other Person admits the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) asserted and accedes to Consequences specified by the ITIA [...], the ITIA will promptly issue a reasoned decision confirming the commission of the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) and the imposition of the specified Consequences [...], will send notice of the decision to the Player or other Person and to each Interested Party, and will Publicly Disclose the decision in accordance with Article 8.6. [...]
 - 7.14.3 Any decision issued by the ITIA in accordance with Article 7.14.2 that an Anti-Doping Rule Violation has been committed [...] will address and determine (without limitation):

(1) the factual basis of the decision that an Anti-Doping Rule Violation was committed; and (2) all of the Consequences to be imposed for such Anti-Doping Rule Violation, including the reasons for imposing the Consequences specified, and in particular the reasons for exercising any discretion not to impose the full Consequences available under this Programme.”

II. The Player's commission of anti-doping rule violations

6. On 15 July 2025, while competing at the ITF WTT M15 event held in Santa Tecla, El Salvador (the **Event**), the Player was required to provide a urine sample for drug testing pursuant to the TADP. The sample he provided was given reference number 1686057 and was split into an A sample and a B sample, which were sealed in tamper-evident bottles and transported to the WADA-accredited laboratory in Montreal (the **Laboratory**) for analysis.
7. The Laboratory detected the presence in sample A1686057 of clomifene. Clomifene is a Prohibited Substance banned under Section S4.2 (Hormone and Metabolic Modulators) of the 2025 WADA Prohibited List. Clomifene is a Specified Substance.
8. The Adverse Analytical Finding reported by the Laboratory in respect of the A sample was considered by an independent Review Board in accordance with TADP Article 7.4. The Review Board did not identify any apparent departures from the applicable sample collection and sample analysis procedures that could have caused this Adverse Analytical Finding, and the Player did not have a valid Therapeutic Use Exemption (**TUE**). It was therefore decided that the Player had a case to answer for breach of TADP Articles 2.1 and/or 2.2.
9. Accordingly, on 29 August 2025, the ITIA sent the Player a formal pre-charge Notice, asserting that the Player had a case to answer for breach of TADP Articles 2.1 and/or 2.2.
10. Given that clomifene is classified as a Specified Substance under the TADP, the Player was not subject to a mandatory provisional suspension under TADP Article 7.12.1.
11. On 9 September 2025, the Player was interviewed by an ITIA investigator. His legal representative was also present at the interview. The Player stated that he had been prescribed clomifene to treat a medical condition.
12. On 9 October 2025, the Player responded to the pre-charge Notice, admitting that he had breached TADP Articles 2.1 and/or 2.2. The Player maintained the position that he had been prescribed clomifene to treat a medical condition.
13. Despite the Player waiving his right to have the B sample opened and analysed, the Laboratory subsequently analysed sample B1686057 and reported, on 17 October 2025, that it had detected the presence of clomifene, i.e., the B sample analysis confirmed the Adverse Analytical Finding made in respect of the A sample.
14. TADP Article 2.1 is a strict liability offence that is established simply by proof that a prohibited substance was present in the Player's sample, i.e., the ITIA does not have to prove how the substance got into the Player's system or that the Player took the substance intentionally (or even knowingly).

15. On 23 October 2025, the ITIA sent the Player a formal Charge Letter, asserting that the presence of clomifene in his sample collected on 15 July 2025 constituted anti-doping rule violations under TADP Articles 2.1 and/or 2.2.
16. On 17 November 2025, after a reminder from the ITIA, the Player informed the ITIA that it should refer to the response submitted in relation to the pre-charge Notice. The ITIA, therefore, considers that the Player continued to admit to committing the anti-doping rule violations with which he was charged.

Consequences

A. Period of Ineligibility

(i) How clomifene got into the Player's system

17. The Player's explanation is that, as part of a routine annual check-up with his family doctor, [REDACTED], he underwent blood tests. The results of the blood tests showed that the Player had [REDACTED] which, in his doctor's opinion, needed urgent treatment to bring his [REDACTED] into the normal range for someone of his age and weight.
18. The Player was prescribed clomifene citrate and advised to take a 50mg tablet twice a week until his [REDACTED] normalised. The Player began taking the clomifene citrate in March 2025.
19. In May 2025, after follow-up blood tests revealed that the Player's [REDACTED] were now within the normal range, the Player stopped taking the clomifene citrate.
20. The ITIA is relying on the Player's account as well as a letter from the Player's doctor.
21. In his interview with the ITIA, the Player stated that he would apply for a retroactive TUE, although despite being provided over three months to do so, no application has been made. It is also uncertain as to whether, even if an application had been made, the independent TUE Committee would have granted a TUE.

(ii) TADP Article 10.2 – Analysis of Intent

22. This is the Player's first doping violation.
23. TADP Article 10.2.1 mandates a four-year ban for a TADP Article 2.1 and/or 2.2 violation that is "*intentional*" and is a first violation.¹ If the prohibited substance in question is classified as a Specified Substance (as here), the ITIA has the burden of proving that the violation was "*intentional*." If the ITIA does not believe, or is not able to prove, that the violation was "*intentional*", then TADP Article 10.2.2 provides for a two-year period of ineligibility, subject to potential further mitigation. TADP Article 10.2.3 explains that in this context "*the term 'intentional' is meant to identify those Players or other Persons who engage in conduct that they knew constituted an Anti-Doping Rule Violation or knew that there was a significant risk that the*

¹ In accordance with TADP Article 10.9.4.1, for the purposes of imposing consequences under the TADP, the anti-doping rule violations will be "*considered together as one single first Anti-Doping Rule Violation, and the sanction imposed will be based on the Anti-Doping Rule Violation that carries the more severe sanction*" if (as here) the Player did not commit the second anti-doping rule violation after he received notice of the first.

conduct might constitute or result in an Anti-Doping Rule Violation and manifestly disregarded that risk". The jurisprudence is clear that what counts in this context is what the Player actually knew, not what he should have known.²

24. The ITIA accepts that the Player did not intentionally breach the provisions of the TADP. The ITIA acknowledges the Player's explanation, that he took a medication containing clomifene (on the advice of his doctor) to treat his [REDACTED].
25. When the Player's urine sample was collected on 15 July 2025, he was asked to declare on the Doping Control Form, "any prescription/non-prescription medications or supplements, including vitamins and minerals, taken over the past 7 days (include substance, dosage and when last taken)". The Player did not list the medication on the Doping Control Form because he had stopped taking the clomifene citrate several months before.
26. Accordingly, the ITIA accepts that in all of the circumstances the Player's commission of the violation was not "intentional" within the meaning of TADP Articles 10.2.1 and 10.2.3, and so the two-year period of ineligibility set out in TADP Article 10.2.2 applies.

(iii) TADP Articles 10.5 and 10.6

27. TADP Article 10.5 provides that if a player establishes that they bear No Fault or Negligence for the anti-doping rule violation in question, the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility will be eliminated. No Fault or Negligence is defined in the TADP as follows: "*The Player or other Person establishing that they did not know or suspect, and could not reasonably have known or suspected even with the exercise of utmost caution, that they had Used or been administered the Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method or otherwise violated an anti-doping rule.*"
28. TADP Article 10.6.1.1 provides that where a player can establish that they bear No Significant Fault or Negligence for anti-doping rule violations involving a Specified Substance (as here), then the otherwise applicable two-year period of ineligibility may be reduced by up to 100% (in which case there would be a reprimand only). Where No Significant Fault or Negligence is found, the amount of reduction to be applied depends upon the degree of the player's Fault.
29. A plea of No Fault or Negligence or No Significant Fault or Negligence is assessed by considering how far the player departed from their duty under the TADP to use "*utmost caution*" to ensure that they would not ingest any prohibited substances or otherwise do anything that might constitute or result in the commission of an anti-doping rule violation.³ "*The difference between the two [...] is one of degree: to establish No Fault or Negligence, the athlete must show that he took every step available to him to avoid the violation, and could not have done any more; whereas to establish No Significant Fault or Negligence, he must show that, to the extent he failed*

² ITF v Sharapova, Independent Tribunal decision dated 6 June 2016, para 68, not challenged on appeal, Sharapova v ITF, CAS 2016/A/4643.

³ See, e.g., Kutrovsky v ITF, CAS 2012/A/2804, para 9.49 ("*the athlete's fault is measured against the fundamental duty that he or she owes under the Programme and the WADC to do everything in his or her power to avoid ingesting any prohibited substance*"); FIFA & WADA, CAS 2005/C/976 & 986, paras 73-75 ("*The WADC imposes on the athlete a duty of utmost caution to avoid that a prohibited substance enters his or her body. [...] It is this standard of utmost care against which the behaviour of an athlete is measured if an anti-doping violation has been identified*").

to take certain steps that were available to him to avoid the violation, the circumstances were exceptional and therefore that failure was not significant".⁴ The TADP definition of Fault⁵ makes clear that the first question is how far the player departed from the duty of utmost caution (objective fault) and the second question is whether there is any acceptable explanation for that failure (subjective fault).

30. The standard of "utmost caution" is very onerous and requires a player to show that he "made every conceivable effort to avoid taking a prohibited substance".⁶ It follows that "even in cases of inadvertent use of a Prohibited Substance, the principle of the Athlete's personal responsibility will usually result in a conclusion that there has been some degree of fault or negligence".⁷
31. The Player initially requested that, should the TUE application not be successful, the ITIA find that he bore No Significant Fault or Negligence, so that a period of ineligibility of less than two years should be imposed, because:
- 31.1 he used a prescribed medication to treat a medical condition, and he was not aware that clomifene was a Prohibited Substance;
- 31.2 he took the medication on the advice of his family doctor.
32. However, Article 1.3.1 of the TADP states that it is the "personal responsibility" of each player bound by the TADP to "be knowledgeable of and comply with this programme at all times", "take responsibility for what they use", "carry out research regarding any products or substance that they intend to use to ensure that using them will not constitute or result in an anti-doping rule violation", and "ensure that any medical treatment they receive does not violate this programme".
33. In the present case, although the ITIA is satisfied that the Player did not intentionally breach the TADP, the ITIA notes that the Player did not undertake any due diligence or research with regards to what the medication was or what it may contain (for example, checking the ingredients of the medication against the WADA Prohibited List), nor did the Player explain to [REDACTED] that he was an athlete subject to anti-doping rules. The Player should have been aware of the requirements to check all medications before ingestion, including, at a minimum, to be aware of what he was ingesting, particularly having completed TIPP in July 2022 and August 2024 and

⁴ IBAF v Luque, IBAF Anti-Doping Tribunal decision dated 13 December 2010, para 6.10.

⁵ "Fault is any breach of duty or any lack of care appropriate to a particular situation. Factors to be taken into consideration in assessing a Player's or other Person's degree of Fault include, for example, the Player's or other Person's experience, whether the Player or other Person is a Protected Person, special considerations such as impairment, the degree of risk that should have been perceived by the Player and the level of care and investigation exercised by the Player in relation to what should have been the perceived level of risk. In assessing the Player's or other Person's degree of Fault, the circumstances considered must be specific and relevant to explain the Player's or other Person's departure from the expected standard of behaviour. Thus, for example, the fact that a Player would lose the opportunity to earn large sums of money during a period of Ineligibility, or the fact that the Player only has a short time left in their career, or the timing of the sporting calendar, would not be relevant factors to be considered in reducing the period of Ineligibility under Article 10.6.1 or 10.6.2".

⁶ Knauss v FIS, CAS 2005/A/847, para 7.3.1; WADA v NSAM et al, CAS 2007/A/1395, para 80 ("The burden is therefore shifted to the athlete to establish that he/she has done all that is possible to avoid a positive testing result").

⁷ Adams v CCES, CAS 2007/A/131, para 155.

having been playing at the professional level since 2017. In completing the anti-doping questions in the TIPP module, the Player answered all questions correctly, including the anti-doping questions relating to players being solely responsible for what they ingest and the need to apply for a TUE, through the TADP portal if it is necessary to use a prohibited substance for medical reasons.

34. The ITIA, therefore, has determined that the player took no steps to mitigate the risk that he was exposed to a prohibited substance and so clearly does not fall within the no significant fault or negligence criteria. In determining the appropriate period of ineligibility and taking the specific facts of this case into account, the ITIA has proposed, and the player has acceded to, the default period of ineligibility of two years.
35. In accordance with TADP Article 10.13. *‘the period of Ineligibility will start on the date of the final decision providing for Ineligibility, or (if the hearing is waived, or there is no hearing) on the date Ineligibility is accepted or otherwise imposed,’* and as such the Player’s two-year period of ineligibility will be deemed to have started running from 9 January 2026. Therefore, it will expire at midnight on 8 January 2028.
36. During his period of ineligibility, the Player’s status will be as set out under TADP Article 10.14, i.e., he may not play, coach or otherwise participate in any capacity in (i) any Covered Event; (ii) any other Event or Competition, or activity (other than authorised anti-doping education or rehabilitation programmes) authorised, organised or sanctioned by the ITF, the ATP, the WTA, any National Association or member of a National Association, or any Signatory, Signatory’s member organisation, or club or member organisation of that Signatory’s member organisation; (iii) any Event or Competition authorised or organised by any professional league or any international or national-level Event or Competition organisation; or (iv) any elite or national-level sporting activity funded by a governmental agency. Nor will he be given accreditation for or otherwise granted access to any Event referred to at points (i) and (ii). In accordance with TADP Article 10.14.5.2, the Player may use the facilities of a club or other member organisation of a Signatory’s member organisation for training purposes in the last two months of his period of ineligibility, i.e., from 8 November 2027.

B. Disqualification of results

37. The results obtained by the Player at the Event and in subsequent events are disqualified pursuant to TADP Articles 9.1 and 10.10, and the points and prize money that he won at those events are forfeited in accordance with the same provisions.

C. Costs

38. Each party shall bear its own costs of dealings with this matter.

D. Publication

39. In accordance with 2025 TADP Article 8.6, this decision will be publicly reported by being posted (in full and/or summary form) on the ITIA’s website.



E. Acceptance by the Player

40. The Player has accepted the consequences proposed above by the ITIA for his anti-doping rule violations and has expressly waived his right to have those consequences determined by the Independent Tribunal at a hearing.

F. Rights of appeal

41. This decision constitutes the final decision of the ITIA, resolving this matter pursuant to 2025 TADP Article 7.14.
42. Further to 2025 TADP Article 13.2.1, each of WADA and USADA has a right to appeal against this decision to the CAS in Lausanne, Switzerland, in accordance with the procedure set out at 2025 TADP Articles 13.8 and 13.9.
43. As part of this resolution of the matter, the Player has waived his right to appeal against or otherwise challenge any aspect of this decision (both as to the finding that the Player has committed anti-doping rule violations and as to the imposition of the consequences set out above), whether pursuant to 2025 TADP Article 13.2.1 or otherwise. However, if an appeal is filed with the CAS against this decision either by WADA or USADA, the Player will be entitled (if so advised) to exercise his right of cross-appeal in accordance with 2025 TADP Article 13.9.4.

Issued Decision of the ITIA

London, 9 January 2026

