

3 September 2026

**DECISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TENNIS INTEGRITY AGENCY
PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 7.14 OF THE 2026 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 World Tennis (previously, the International Tennis Federation), 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 2026 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. Nick Kyrgios (**‘the Player’**) is a 31-year-old tennis player from Australia. He has achieved a career-high world singles ranking of 13.² He first registered online for an International Player Identification Number (IPIN) in order to play in his first professional tennis tournament in 2010 and in subsequent years. Thereby, the Player expressly agreed to be bound by and to comply with the Programme. By virtue of that agreement, and his participation in Covered Events (including ATP and Grand Slam events), the Player became bound by and was required to comply with the TADP at all relevant times.
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, Cocaine, which is a Substance of Abuse as defined in the TADP. TADP Articles 2.1 and 2.2 read:

“Doping is defined as the occurrence of one or more of the following (each, an Anti-Doping Rule Violation):

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. This ITIA issued decision is made in accordance with Article 10.2.4 of the TADP, which provides:

“10.2.4 Notwithstanding any other provision in Article 10.2, where the Anti-Doping Rule Violation involves a Substance of Abuse:

10.2.4.1 If the Player can establish that any ingestion or Use occurred Out-of-

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 [Nick Kyrgios ATP Player Overview](#)

Competition and was unrelated to sport performance, the period of Ineligibility will be three months, provided that it may be further reduced to one month if the Player satisfactorily completes a Substance of Abuse treatment program approved by the ITIA. The period of Ineligibility established in this Article 10.2.4.1 is not subject to any reduction based on any provision in Article 10.6.

II. The Player's commission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation and Procedural History

5. On Monday 22 June 2026, while competing in the men's singles competition at the ATP 250 Vanda Pharmaceuticals Championships event held in Mallorca, Spain from 21 to 27 June 2026 ('**the Event**'), the Player was required to provide a urine sample for anti-doping testing under the TADP. The sample was given reference number 1926574 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 for Cocaine metabolite: benzoylecgonine, which is prohibited under the Programme, in the category of Stimulants (section S6.A of the 2026 Prohibited List). Cocaine is a non-Specified Substance. The Player does not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption ('**TUE**') permitting use of Cocaine.
6. 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.
7. The ITIA sent the Player a (pre-charge) Notice on Tuesday 4 August 2026, 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 Cocaine is classified as a non-Specified Substance under the TADP, the Player was subject to a mandatory provisional suspension under TADP Article 7.12.1. The (pre-charge) Notice informed the Player that the B sample would be analysed on Tuesday 11 August 2026 (unless the possible violation was admitted prior to that date). That analysis accordingly went ahead and was conducted in the presence of a representative of the Player.
8. On Wednesday 12 August 2026 the Player was informed that the B sample analysis confirmed the presence of Cocaine metabolite: benzoylecgonine.
9. On Tuesday 18 August 2026 the Player was interviewed by an ITIA investigator. During this interview, the Player admitted to consuming Cocaine, Out-of-Competition, in the early hours of 20 June 2026. The Player stated that he had attended a party at 10pm on 19 June 2026, held in the hotel where he was staying for the duration of the Event. He then travelled to a nightclub in Magaluf with some other people he had met at the party. At the nightclub he used Cocaine provided by another person, before returning to the hotel at around 3am in the morning of 20 June 2026.
10. On Friday 21 August 2026 in response to the ITIA's (pre-charge) Notice, the Player accepted

that he had committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under TADP Article 2.1 and asserted that he had consumed Cocaine Out-of-Competition and it was unrelated to sports performance. The Player asserted that he ingested Cocaine at a nightclub in the early hours of 20 June 2026, in the circumstances set out in his interview on 18 August 2026, and sought to rely upon the process established by TADP Article 10.2.4.

11. The ITIA consulted with the Laboratory who confirmed that the Player's stated use of Cocaine was consistent with the concentration in his sample and accepted that the Player's Use was Out-Of-Competition³. The WADA Prohibited List does not prohibit the use of Cocaine Out-of-Competition.
12. On Friday 28 August 2026 the Player provided details of a Substance of Abuse treatment programme he had commenced, his personalised schedule for his first session on 26 August 2026 and an invoice confirming the programme had been paid for. The ITIA conducted research into the programme to confirm whether it complied with the requirements of TADP Article 10.2.4.1.
13. On Tuesday 1 September 2026, the ITIA formally charged the Player with the commission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under TADP Article 2.1. 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).
14. On Thursday 3 September 2026, the Player responded to the formal charge letter. He reiterated his acceptance of the Anti-Doping Rule Violation and assertion that his consumption took place Out-of-Competition (i.e. in the early hours of 20 June) and was not related to sports performance, seeking to rely upon the process established by TADP Article 10.2.4.
15. Accordingly, the breach of TADP Article 2.1 was established. This is the Player's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.

III. Consequences

A. Applicability of TADP Article 10.2.4 sanctioning process

16. The Player asserted that his Adverse Analytical Finding was caused by taking the Prohibited Substance Out-of-Competition in a context with no link to his sports performance.
17. In support of his explanation, the Player provided a witness statement from [REDACTED] who confirmed that he had attended the party at the hotel with the Player shortly after 10pm on 19 June 2026, and attached a video he had taken of the Player at the party. [REDACTED] confirmed that he had retired to his room at around 11.45pm, at which time the Player informed him he was going to leave with a group he had met at the party to go to a nightclub in Magaluf. [REDACTED] confirmed that the following day he met the Player for lunch, and noticed that the Player was showing signs of Cocaine use from the night before. The Player's account was corroborated pharmacokinetically by the Laboratory.

³ The first match of the main draw of the Event took place on 21 June 2026, and accordingly the In-Competition period commenced at 11.59pm local time on 20 June 2026, pursuant to TADP Article 5.3.3.1.

18. In view of the evidence, the ITIA accepted that the Player's *"ingestion or Use occurred out-of-competition and was unrelated to sports performance."* Therefore, his case qualified for the process set out in TADP Article 10.2.4.1.

B. Period of Ineligibility

19. The default period of Ineligibility under TADP Article 10.2.4.1 is three months. The sanction may be further reduced to one month if the Player satisfactorily completes a Substance of Abuse treatment programme approved by the ITIA.
20. If the Player does not satisfactorily meet the above conditions, the sanction will revert back to three months, and the additional two months will fall to be served pursuant to a further decision which would be issued by the ITIA at such time. However, for the time being, the sanction on a conditional basis is one month of Ineligibility.
21. As the Player was subject to a provisional suspension from 4 August 2026, his (conditional) one-month period of Ineligibility is backdated to that date. Therefore, the one-month concludes at 23:59 on 3 September 2026.

C. Disqualification of results

22. The Player's results at the Event are automatically disqualified in accordance with TADP Articles 9.1 and 10.1.1 (including forfeiture of any medals, titles, ranking points, and prize money received as a result of participation in the Event).
23. TADP Article 10.10 states:

"Unless fairness requires otherwise, in addition to the Disqualification of results under Articles 9.1 and 10.1, any other results obtained by the Player in Competitions taking place in the period starting on the date the Sample in question was collected or other Anti-Doping Rule Violation occurred and ending on the commencement of any Provisional Suspension or Ineligibility period, will be Disqualified, with all of the resulting consequences, including forfeiture of any medals, titles, ranking points and Prize Money)."

24. In this case, fairness requires that only the Player's results at the Event are disqualified.

D. Costs

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

E. Publication

26. TADP Article 10.15 states:

"10.15 Automatic publication of Consequences

A mandatory Consequence in every case where an Anti-Doping Rule Violation has been committed will be automatic publication, as provided in Articles 8.6 and 13.11."

27. Accordingly, this Decision will be publicly reported by being posted (in full and/or redacted

form) on the ITIA's website.

F. Notification

28. On Thursday 3 September 2026, the Player was advised of the ITIA's decision pursuant to TADP Article 10.2.4.1, the written reasons for which are set out in this Decision issued on Thursday 3 September 2026.

IV. Rights of appeal

29. This Decision constitutes the final decision of the ITIA resolving this matter pursuant to TADP Article 10.2.4.1.
30. Further to TADP Article 13.2, each of WADA and the National Anti-Doping Organisation of Australia (Sport Integrity Australia) has a right to appeal against this Decision to the CAS in Lausanne, Switzerland, in accordance with the procedure set out at TADP Article 13.9.

V. Summary

31. The Anti-Doping Rule Violation was admitted. On the conditions set out in this Decision, the Player is subject to a one-month period of Ineligibility pursuant to TADP Article 10.2.4.1. The one-month (conditional) period of Ineligibility commenced on 4 August 2026 and will conclude on 3 September 2026 on which date he shall be free to return to tennis subject to the conditions set out in this issued Decision. If the Player fails to comply with those conditions, they will be subject to an additional two months of Ineligibility to be imposed by the ITIA in a subsequent decision.

Issued Decision of the ITIA

London, 3 September 2026