

6 July 2026

**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 (**'the ITIA'**) is the delegated third party, under the World Anti-Doping Code (**'the Code'**), of the International Tennis Federation (**'the 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 2025 Tennis Anti-Doping Programme (**'the TADP or the Programme'**), which sets out Code-compliant anti-doping rules applicable to players competing in Covered Events.¹
2. Facundo Bagnis (**'the Player'**) is a 35-year-old tennis player from Argentina. He has achieved a career-high world singles ranking of 55.² By virtue of (amongst other things) his ATP ranking in 2025 (and preceding years), and his participation in Covered Events, the Player was bound by and was required to comply with the Programme.
3. The ITIA notified the Player of the commission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Article 2.1 and/or Article 2.2 of the TADP involving a substance, Hydrochlorothiazide. TADP Articles 2.1 and 2.2 read:

"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. This ITIA issued decision is made in accordance with Article 7.14 of the TADP, which provides:

"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 [...]"

¹ Any term in this Decision that begins with a capital letter and is not otherwise defined in this Decision has the meaning given to it in the Programme.

² [Facundo Bagnis | Player Activity | ATP Tour | Tennis](#)

- 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 an Anti-Doping Rule Violation

6. On 18 August 2025, while competing in the men's singles competition at the US Open Grand Slam tournament held in New York, United States, from 18 August to 7 September 2025 ('the Event'), the Player was required to provide a urine sample for anti-doping testing under the TADP. The sample was given reference number 1685506 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 Montréal, Canada ('the Laboratory') for analysis. The Laboratory reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in Sample A1685506 for Hydrochlorothiazide.
7. Hydrochlorothiazide is prohibited under the Programme, in the category of Diuretics and Masking Agents (section S5 of the 2025 Prohibited List). Hydrochlorothiazide is a Specified Substance. The Player does not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption ('TUE') permitting use of Hydrochlorothiazide.
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 sample collection procedures set out in the International Standard for Testing and Investigations or from the sample analysis procedures set out in the International Standard for Laboratories that could have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding. The Review Board noted the Player does not have a TUE. It therefore decided that the Player had a case to answer for breach of TADP Article 2.1 and/or TADP Article 2.2.
9. The ITIA sent the Player a (pre-charge) Notice on 2 October 2025, advising him of his Adverse Analytical Finding and that he may have committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under TADP Article 2.1 (presence of a Prohibited Substance in his Sample) and/or TADP Article 2.2 (Use or Attempted Use of a Prohibited Substance). Given that Hydrochlorothiazide 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.
10. On 13 October 2025, the Player was interviewed by an ITIA investigator. The Player denied having deliberately or knowingly used Hydrochlorothiazide and he indicated that the Hydrochlorothiazide found in his sample was likely to be as a result of inadvertently ingesting a contaminated vitamin or medication that he had consumed in the days/weeks before sample collection.

11. On 15 October 2025, the Player, via his legal representative, requested a 30-day extension to respond to the (pre-charge) Notice. This extended the deadline to respond from 16 October 2025 to 15 November 2025.
12. On 18 October 2025, the Player elected to enter a voluntary provisional suspension under TADP Article 7.12.6.
13. On 30 October 2025, the Player, who had waived his right to have his B sample analysed, was notified that the Laboratory had proceeded with the B sample analysis (B1685506), which confirmed the presence of Hydrochlorothiazide made in respect of the A sample.
14. On 15 November 2025, the Player via his legal representative, requested an extension to 24 November 2025 to respond to the (pre-charge) Notice.
15. On 24 November 2025, the Player via his legal representative, requested an extension to 27 November 2025 to respond to the (pre-charge) Notice.
16. On 28 November 2025 in response to the ITIA's (pre-charge) Notice letter, the Player accepted, via his legal representative, that he had committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation and asserted that his positive test derived from cross-contamination by a compound pharmacy in Argentina (**'the Pharmacy'**) which produced the Player's bespoke vitamin supplement, Digestive (**'the Bespoke Supplement'**).³
17. On 20 January 2026, the ITIA formally charged the Player with the commission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under TADP Article 2.1 and/or TADP Article 2.2. TADP Article 2.1 is a strict liability offence that is established simply by proof that a Prohibited Substance was present in the 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).
18. On 4 February 2026, the Player responded to the formal charge letter. He reiterated his acceptance that Hydrochlorothiazide was present in his sample collected on 18 August 2025, and therefore admitting to the Anti-Doping Rule Violations with which he was charged.

III. Consequences

A. Period of Ineligibility

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

19. The Player has asserted that he did not intend to cheat and did not knowingly ingest Hydrochlorothiazide. The Player asserted that his doctor, an expert in sports medicine, prescribed a Bespoke Supplement (which contained enzymes and a digestive aid to assist with digestion and with deficiencies identified in the Player's laboratory blood profile in January 2025), specifically created to order by a compound pharmacy in Argentina, and that (unknown to him) the Bespoke Supplement was contaminated with Hydrochlorothiazide. The Player confirmed he had taken one capsule, occasionally, when he had a meal relatively close training session pre-Event or during the Event, to facilitate digestion.

³ Due to a technical error in the TADP portal, the Player's response was withdrawn and resubmitted on 19 January 2026.

20. In support of his explanation, the Player submitted,

- a. WhatsApp communications between the Player and his doctor, Dr [REDACTED], on 24 February 2025 and 7 March 2025, in which Dr [REDACTED] advised the Player to take the Bespoke Supplement, and he provided assurances regarding the preparation of compound supplements at the Pharmacy;
 - b. WhatsApp communications between the Player and the Pharmacy to place the order for the Bespoke Supplement on 10 March 2025;
 - c. Dr [REDACTED] medical prescription to the Pharmacy, sent by the doctor on behalf of the Player, for the Bespoke Supplement dated 12 March 2025;
 - d. A receipt from the Pharmacy to Dr [REDACTED] confirming purchase of the Bespoke Supplement for the Player on 21 March 2025;
 - e. A blood evaluation profile of the Player, dated 21 January 2025, following which the Player commenced an individualised supplementation plan to correct the identified deficiencies;
 - f. An expert report from Professor Kintz, forensic toxicologist, dated 31 October 2025, which sets out analysis in respect of the Player's hair and toenail samples, confirming that Hydrochlorothiazide was not detected in the Player's hair and toenails in the six months preceding sample collection; and
 - g. An expert report from Dr Luis Ferrari, toxicologist, dated 28 November 2025, which included a review of Professor Kintz's findings and identified the presence of Hydrochlorothiazide in the Bespoke Supplement at an estimated concentration of approximately 0.11mg per pill.
21. On 3 December 2025, the ITIA requested that the Player provide additional information including the batch number of the Bespoke Supplement, being used by the Player, at the time of the sample collection, confirmation of the number of bottles produced, and how many pills remained in the open bottle that the Player used.
22. On 15 December 2025, the Player, via his legal representative, asserted that due to the limited information available on the Bespoke Supplement bottle, the batch number was not explicitly known but a control number was provided. The Player also confirmed that the Pharmacy produced two bottles of the Bespoke Supplement (only one bottle remained as the Player had used one full bottle) and that there were some pills remaining from that batch.
23. On 5 January 2026, the ITIA confirmed that it would carry out independent confirmatory testing of the Bespoke Supplement by a WADA accredited laboratory. The ITIA consulted Dr Jean François Naud, deputy director of the Laboratory. The Laboratory detected Hydrochlorothiazide in the Bespoke Supplement at a concentration of 35.4µg per capsule.⁴ Dr Naud confirmed that the urinary concentration of the sample collected, from the Player, on 18 August 2025 could have been caused by the Player's ingestion of the contaminated Bespoke Supplement.⁵

⁴ The Laboratory tested five capsules and this is the average concentration of Hydrochlorothiazide detected in those capsules. The individual values are: 38.8, 33.2, 36.3, 34.0 and 34.7µg per capsule.

⁵ The Player supplied a dosing schedule setting out his use of the Bespoke Supplement in the days/weeks before 18 August 2025.

24. Given all of the circumstances of this case, the ITIA accepts the Player has established that it is more likely than not that the presence of Hydrochlorothiazide found in his urine sample 1685506 was due to the presence of Hydrochlorothiazide (an undisclosed ingredient) in capsules of a Bespoke Supplement that he consumed before he provided the sample 1685506.

(i) TADP Article 10.2

25. This is the Player's first doping violation.
26. 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.⁶ 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 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.⁷
27. As set out above, the ITIA has accepted that an undisclosed ingredient of the Bespoke Supplement was more likely than not the source of the Player's positive test. While there have been previous cases of contaminated supplements, particularly those manufactured at compound pharmacies, the Player (i) did not know that the Bespoke Supplement contained Hydrochlorothiazide (as not on the product label or the information is not available in a reasonable Internet search), (ii) consulted with his treating medical doctor, with extensive sports medicine experience, in advance of consuming the Bespoke Supplement and (iii), had been given reassurances from his doctor, that several Olympic athletes had used the Pharmacy before without issue.
28. In such circumstances, the ITIA considers that the Player did not manifestly disregard the risk that the Bespoke Supplement contained a prohibited substance. Accordingly, the ITIA accepts that 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.

(ii) TADP Articles 10.5 and 10.6

29. TADP Article 10.5 provides that if a player establishes that he bears 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."
30. TADP Article 10.6.1.2 provides that where the player can establish that he bears No Significant Fault or Negligence and that the prohibited substance came from a Contaminated Product, then the

⁶ 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

⁷ ITF v Sharapova, Independent Tribunal decision dated 6 June 2016, para 68, not challenged on appeal, Sharapova v ITF, CAS 2016/A/4643.

otherwise applicable two-year period of Ineligibility may be reduced by up to 100% (in which case there would be a reprimand only). A 'Contaminated Product' is defined in the TADP as a "product that contains a Prohibited Substance that is not disclosed on the product label or in information available in a reasonable Internet search". The definition of No Significant Fault or Negligence is: "The Player or other Person establishing that their Fault or Negligence, when viewed in the totality of the circumstances and taking into account the criteria for No Fault or Negligence, was not significant in relation to the Anti-Doping Rule Violation". Where No Significant Fault or Negligence is found, the amount of reduction to be applied depends upon the degree of the player's Fault.

31. 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.⁸ "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 to take certain steps that were available to him to avoid the violation, the circumstances were exceptional and therefore that failure was not significant".⁹ The TADP definition of Fault¹⁰ 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).
32. 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".¹¹ 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".¹²

⁸ 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").

⁹ *IBAF v Luque*, IBAF Anti-Doping Tribunal decision dated 13 December 2010, para 6.10.

¹⁰ 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".

¹¹ *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").

¹² *Adams v CCES*, CAS 2007/A/131, para 155.

33. When the Player's urine sample was collected on 18 August 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)"*. While the ITIA considers the Player's omission of the Bespoke Supplement from the Doping Control Form to be unsatisfactory, it accepts it was an oversight on behalf of the Player.
34. The ITIA considers that the Player bears No Significant Fault or Negligence for his violation and that a period of Ineligibility of less than two years should be imposed, because the Player:
- a. consulted a doctor with expertise in sports medicine (including with Olympic athletes) and only took the Bespoke Supplement because it was recommended by the doctor;
 - b. explicitly raised anti-doping contamination concerns directly with his doctor prior to purchasing the Bespoke Supplement;
 - c. verified the declared ingredients in the medical prescription did not contain prohibited substances (via his doctor);
 - d. requested and relied on the doctor's express endorsement of the specific pharmacy;
 - e. purchased the Bespoke Supplement from a reputable local pharmaceutical company that is widely used and trusted by Argentine athletes; and
 - f. used the Bespoke Supplement responsibly as part of the doctor's recommendation to treat identified medical deficiencies.
 - g. provided information, via his doctor, that Olympic athletes had used the Pharmacy and no anti-doping violation/issue had arisen in 20 years
35. The ITIA accepts that these factors weigh in the Player's favour. However:
- a. 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"*.
 - b. Article 4.2.1.5 of the TADP specifically reminds players that *"[m]any Prohibited Substances may appear (either as listed ingredients or otherwise, e.g., as unlisted contaminants) within supplements and/or medications that may be available with or without a physician's prescription. Since Players are strictly liable for any Prohibited Substances present in Samples collected from them (see Article 2.1.1), they are responsible for ensuring that Prohibited Substances do not enter or come to be present in their bodies by any means and that Prohibited Methods are not Used"*.
 - c. In any event, it has long been known that supplements may contain substances that are not listed as a named ingredient. The comment to Code Article 10.5 is clear that a plea of No Fault or Negligence cannot succeed in the case of *"a positive test resulting from a mislabelled or contaminated vitamin or nutritional supplement (Athletes are responsible for what they ingest (Article 2.1.1) and have been warned against the possibility of supplement contamination"*. This is the case whether the supplement is an off-the-shelf product produced in bulk by a manufacturer or a bespoke product mixed at a compound

pharmacy.

- d. In the latter case, there have been several cases in South America of bespoke supplements mixed at compound pharmacies turning out to contain not only the listed ingredients from the prescription but also prohibited substances. Specifically in tennis, several other players: (i) Thomaz Bellucci, (ii) Igor Marcondes, (iii) Franco Agamenone, (iv) Camilla Bossi, (v) Beatriz Haddad Maia, (vi) Nicholas Jarry and (vii) Gilbert Klier Junior, (viii) Victor Bini have tested positive for prohibited substances in the last six years. In each case, the positive test was found to be due to the contamination of bespoke supplements produced in compound pharmacies in South America. Those players received bans of up to 13 months. Each of those cases were reported on the ITF or ITIA website at the time and, more widely, in the media.
 - e. On 12 September 2019, the ITF issued a warning on its website (which was also communicated to Players and other stakeholders via the ATP PlayerZone website on 12 September 2019 in English and 18 September 2019 in Spanish). The warning reminded Players and Player Support Personnel that *“the risk of violating the [TADP] due to supplement use remains high,” and while “[s]upplements from all regions may pose an elevated risk of an anti-doping violation [...] [p]layers in South America should be on particularly high alert to the use of supplements, including those prepared in pharmacies, as several violations arising from supplements prepared by similar sources have occurred in that region.”*
 - f. On 17 August 2020, the ATP posted on its Player Zone website (which is communicated to Players), key anti -doping reminders, which included *“Supplements are not recommended. If used, check them with organisations that conduct batch testing”*.
 - g. It is apparent that the consumption of bespoke supplements, in particular those made in compound pharmacies in South America, carries a significant degree of risk for athletes who are subject to anti-doping rules, and the escalating bans that have been imposed on tennis players for such violations have not been adequate to deter other players from taking those risks. The ITIA (i) urges all players to exercise extreme caution in considering whether to use supplements (and has a specific area on its website dedicated to supplements); and (ii) warns that any TADP violation that results from the ingestion of contaminated supplements will likely lead to a significant period of Ineligibility.
36. As a result of the foregoing, the Player knew, and is deemed to have been on specific notice that, there is a significant risk that bespoke supplements (particularly those compounded in South American pharmacies) may contain prohibited substances that are not listed as ingredients.
37. In the circumstances, the Player was right not to pursue a plea of No Fault or Negligence, because it is not sustainable on these facts. However, the Code comment to Article 10.5 that is quoted above goes on to say: *“depending on the unique facts of a particular case, any of the referenced illustrations could result in a reduced sanction under Article 10.6 based on No Significant Fault or Negligence”*. The ITIA accepts that, in the specific circumstances of this case, the Player's fault was not ‘significant’ within the meaning of TADP Article 10.6.1, justifying a reduction from the two-year starting point. The ITIA also accepts that the Player has shown that the prohibited substance in his sample came from a Contaminated Product, in that the prohibited substance was not disclosed on the product label, nor would it have been disclosed in information available in a reasonable internet search. Therefore, discretion arises to reduce the two-year ban applicable under TADP Article 10.2.2 by up to 24 months, depending on the Player’s level of objective and subjective fault.

38. In determining the appropriate period of Ineligibility, the ITIA is mindful of the bans imposed in other recent tennis cases involving supplements. The Player should have been on notice due to recent cases of contaminated supplements, particularly those mixed in a compound pharmacy. In addition, it appears that the previous sanctions have not been sufficient to deter players from using utmost caution to avoid ingesting prohibited substances even inadvertently. Taking the foregoing and the specific facts of this case into account, the ITIA has proposed, and the Player has acceded to, a period of Ineligibility of 12 months.
39. As the Player entered into a voluntary provisional suspension his 12-month period of Ineligibility will run from 18 October 2025 and will expire at midnight on 17 October 2026.
40. 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).
41. 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 17 August 2026.

B. Disqualification of results

42. 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

43. Each party shall bear its own costs of dealing with this matter.

D. Publication

44. 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

45. 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

46. This decision constitutes the final decision of the ITIA, resolving this matter pursuant to 2025 TADP Article 7.14.



47. Further to 2025 TADP Article 13.2.1, each of WADA and the NADO Argentina (CNAD) 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.
48. 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 CNAD, 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, 6 July 2026

Tennis you can **trust.**

The logo consists of two horizontal blue lines of equal length, positioned centrally below the text.