



*Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d’Ethique de la Gymnastique*

Disciplinary Commission

GEF - Gymnastics Ethics Foundation v. Ms. Evangelia Trikomiti and European Gymnastics

DECISION

rendered on 6 February 2025 by the

GYMNASTICS ETHICS FOUNDATION DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

sitting in the following composition:

President	Mr. Thomas Hayn (Austria)
Members	Ms. Melanie Schärer (Switzerland) Mr. Daniele Moro (Switzerland)
Ad hoc secretary	Ms. Yoana Yankova (United Kingdom)

In the disciplinary proceedings between:

The **Gymnastics Ethics Foundation**

- **Claimant** -

and

**Ms. Evangelia Trikomiti
European Gymnastics**

- **Respondent(s)** -



Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d’Ethique de la Gymnastique

Disciplinary Commission

Table of contents

List of abbreviations	3
I. Parties to the proceedings.....	4
II. Factual Background and Procedural History	4
A. Summary of relevant facts and allegations	4
B. Procedural history	6
III. Jurisdiction.....	8
<i>Burden and standard of proof</i>	9
IV. Applicable Law	9
V. Position of the Parties and Requests for Relief	9
A. GEF.....	10
B. The Respondents.....	10
VI. Merits	12
A. Analysis of the Charges against Ms. Trikomiti.....	12
<i>The RG scoring system</i>	12
<i>The Panels at the RGECE</i>	12
<i>Ms. Trikomiti’s behaviour</i>	14
<i>Conclusion</i>	17
B. Legal discussion	17
i. Field of Play Doctrine	17
ii. Manipulation.....	17
iii. Liability of European Gymnastics	19
iv. Sanctions	19
v. Findings	21
VII. Publication.....	21
Notice of Appeal	23



Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d’Ethique de la Gymnastique

Disciplinary Commission

List of abbreviations

<i>Art.</i>	Article
<i>Arts.</i>	Articles
<i>CAS</i>	Court of Arbitration for Sport
<i>CC</i>	Swiss Civil Code
<i>CEO</i>	Chief Executive Officer
<i>cf.</i>	Confer (compare)
<i>ch.</i>	Chapter
<i>CHF</i>	Swiss Franc
<i>CO</i>	Swiss Code of Obligations
<i>CoD</i>	FIG Code of Discipline
<i>CoE</i>	FIG Code of Ethics
<i>CoP</i>	FIG Code of Points
<i>DA</i>	Difficulty Artistry
<i>DB</i>	Difficulty Body
<i>DC</i>	GEF Disciplinary Commission
<i>EG</i>	European Gymnastics
<i>e.g.</i>	Exempli gratia (for example)
<i>et seq.</i>	Et sequens (and the following)
<i>FIG</i>	Fédération International Gymnastique
<i>FIG EC</i>	Fédération International Gymnastique Executive Committee
<i>GEF</i>	Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
<i>i.e.</i>	Id est (this is)
<i>[judges panel] A</i>	[judges panel] Artistry
<i>[judges panel] E</i>	[judges panel] Execution
<i>let.</i>	Letter
<i>Mr.</i>	Mister
<i>Ms.</i>	Miss
<i>p.</i>	Page
<i>para.</i>	Paragraph
<i>paras.</i>	Paragraphs
<i>pp.</i>	Pages
<i>RG</i>	Rhythmic Gymnastics
<i>RGEC</i>	Rhythmic Gymnastics European Championships
<i>RGTC</i>	Rhythmic Gymnastics Technical Committee
<i>TC</i>	Technical Committee
<i>v.</i>	Versus



**Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d’Ethique de la Gymnastique**

Disciplinary Commission

I. Parties to the proceedings

1. The Parties in these proceedings are the Gymnastics Ethics Foundation (“*GEF*”), Claimant, and Ms. Evangelia Trikomiti and European Gymnastics (“*EG*”), Respondents.
2. The GEF, the Claimant, is a non-profit foundation under Swiss Law, established by the International Gymnastics Federation (Fédération Internationale de Gymnastique / “*FIG*”). The GEF has its seat in Lausanne, Switzerland, and it acts independently from the FIG.
3. Ms. Evangelia Trikomiti, the first Respondent, is a Gymnastics Judge from Cyprus, holding a category 2 Brevet in Rhythmic Gymnastics (“*RG*”) for individual Gymnasts and for Groups (for the 2022-24 cycle). She is the President of the Rhythmic Gymnastics Technical Committee (“*RGTC*”) of European Gymnastics.
4. European Gymnastics, the second Respondent, is the Continental Union for Europe recognised by the FIG. It is a non-profit association established under Swiss Law with its seat in Lausanne, Switzerland.
5. The Parties shall be referred herein collectively as the “Parties”.

II. Factual Background and Procedural History

6. Below is a summary of facts and allegations drawn from the Parties’ written exchanges. Additional facts and allegations may be set out, where relevant, in connection with the legal discussion that follows. In reaching its conclusion, the Panel has duly taken into consideration all arguments advanced by the Parties therein, although not specifically addressed in the below section of the present decision (the “Decision”).

A. Summary of relevant facts and allegations

7. The Panel now sets out the relevant factual background. The Panel has taken into consideration all the facts presented to it by the Parties, however, that which is set out below is, in its view, most relevant for the outcome of this case.
8. From 23 to 26 May 2024, the Rhythmic Gymnastics European Championships (RGEC) took place in Budapest. The individual all-around qualification of the European Championships was the last possibility for one European individual to qualify for the Paris 2024 Summer Olympic Games. The main contenders for the Olympic qualification were Ms. Liliana Lewinska (POL), Ms. Panagiota Lytra (GRE) and Ms. Vera Tugolukova (CYP). At the end, Ms. Tugolukova qualified for the Olympic Games, having 0,25 points more than Ms. Lewinska.
9. Ms. Trikomiti served as President of the Superior Jury at the RGEC in Budapest.



Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d’Ethique de la Gymnastique

Disciplinary Commission

10. In accordance with art.7.8.1 of the FIG Technical Regulations, the Superior Jury, composed of the President and the Members of the Technical Committee and other approved judges, is responsible, *inter alia*,
- to supervise the competition and to deal with any breaches of discipline or any extraordinary circumstances affecting the conduct of the competition;
 - to assess a grave error of judgement on the part of one or several judges;
 - to review the scores by the judges and to issue a warning to any judge whose work is unsatisfactory or who shows partiality;
 - to remove and substitute any judge who disregarded a previous warning;
 - to take the final decision about inquiries.
11. At the end of the gymnast’s routine, each member of the judges panel (A, E) and each judges panel (DA, DB) enters the score in the computer system. The members of the Superior Jury also type in their respective scores. The scores of the judges panel will be considered as the final scores, unless a score is blocked by the result system. The result system blocks automatically in case of non-allowed deviations between the scores of a judges panel and the score of the relevant supervisor (member of the Superior Jury). The allowed range of deviation varies and is defined in the Appendix of the Code of Points. If a score is blocked, the President of the Superior Jury gives the judges concerned the opportunity to change their score. If they do not do so, the President of the Superior Jury may overrule them.
12. The GEF accuses Ms. Trikomiti of acting partially in favour of the Cypriot gymnast Ms. Vera Tugolukova respectively against her competitors for the Olympic qualification, especially Ms. Lewinska from Poland. It alleges that Ms. Trikomiti in her function as President of the Technical Committee unduly interfered with the judges’ work, in particular when it came to Ms. Lewinska’s, Ms. Lytra’s and Ms. Tugolukova’s routines. According to the GEF, she manipulated the competition through interfering in the scores to ensure that “her” athlete, the athlete from Cyprus, obtained the Olympic quota. Thus, she infringed – according to the GEF –
- Art. 2 let. g) of the FIG Code of Ethics providing that FIG judges are not permitted to demonstrate undue pressure or influence the vote or the direction of decisions made in the FIG, and especially must avoid any cooperation sought by influencing the work and evaluation of the judges;
 - the Judge and Official specific principles of the FIG Code of Conduct providing for absolute fairness, impartiality and consistency in all judging situations;



Gymnastics Ethics Foundation Fondation d'Éthique de la Gymnastique

Disciplinary Commission

- the FIG General Judges' Rules providing that judges officiating at competitions shall maintain integrity of all decisions, showing no preference or bias and respect the judges' oath and the FIG Code of Ethics;
 - the Judge's Oath.
13. The GEF therefore requests – with respect to Ms. Trikomiti - to declare that Ms. Trikomiti has breached several FIG rules by manipulating the score of the 2024 RGEC; to impose a period of ineligibility of 6 years of all gymnastics related activities and to annul her FIG Judge Brevet and coach certificate. With respect to European Gymnastics, it requests to hold European Gymnastics responsible for the offence committed by Ms. Trikomiti and to order the payment of €10,000 for the reimbursement of the GEF's investigative costs.

B. Procedural history

14. On 23 July 2024, the GEF appointed a Disciplinary Commission Panel (the "*Panel*") consisting of Ms. Melanie Schärer, Mr. Daniele Moro and Mr. Thomas Hayn to hear this case. The Panel elected Mr. Thomas Hayn as President of the Panel.
15. Pursuant to art. 16 of the FIG CoD, Ms. Yoana Yankova was appointed as Panel ad hoc secretary.
16. On the same date, the GEF opened a Disciplinary Proceeding against the Respondents and submitted a Notice of Charges, also requesting for a provisional measure in the form of a (provisional) suspension of Ms. Trikomiti.
17. Following an exchange of correspondence concerning the provisional measure, the Panel held a hearing on the provisional measure on 1 August 2024 and decided on 7 August 2024 to suspend Ms. Trikomiti for a period of 30 days.
18. On 8 August 2024, the Panel informed the Parties that it intended to hold the hearing on the merits on 23 September 2024 and gave the Parties the opportunity to provide written submissions by 22 August 2024 (Respondents), 2 September 2024 (GEF) and 13 September 2024 (Respondents).
19. On 9 August 2024, the Respondents asserted that the time for the hearing was too short and that the hearing should take place in person. On 15 August 2024, the GEF denied the need for a longer hearing as well as for a hearing in person. In the following correspondence, the Parties repeated their points of view. On 20 August 2024, the Panel confirmed the directions given on 8 August 2024.
20. On 22 August 2024, the Respondents filed their submissions. They applied for an adjournment of the hearing until the end of the GEF's investigation against other members of the Superior Jury acting at the RGEC. They further requested the Panel to grant an order summoning and/or joining to these proceedings all members of the Superior Jury and Judges Panel that attended the



**Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d'Éthique de la Gymnastique**

Disciplinary Commission

Championships. Besides, they put forward to make orders requiring the GEF and the FIG to disclose some documents defined in detail. Finally, they asked to hear all the Respondents' witnesses at the hearing.

21. On 2 September 2024, the Panel set a deadline for the GEF to respond to the Respondents' applications by the same date but suspended the other deadlines. It informed the Parties that it would decide on the Respondents' applications as soon as possible.
22. On 2 September 2024, the GEF objected the Respondents' applications.
23. On 6 September 2024, the GEF informed the Panel that it was ready to file its reply on the merits without further delay to ensure that the matter could be heard on 23 September.
24. On 9 September 2024, the Panel decided to dismiss the application concerning the adjournment of the hearing, the summoning of other members of the Superior Jury and the disclosure of further documents by the GEF, but ordered the FIG to disclose the full report of the panel of independent experts in relation to the top 20 gymnasts at the Championships. It set new deadlines for further written replies for 11 September 2024 (GEF) and 18 September 2024 (Respondents). It finally confirmed the date for the hearing on 23 September 2024 and stated that it would decide after receipt of all submissions which witnesses should be heard in person at the hearing.
25. On 10 September 2024, the Respondents claimed that the time between their decision on which witness would be heard in person at the hearing and the date of the hearing was too short to make all the necessary arrangements for the hearing. They asked the Panel to take this decision by 13 September 2024.
26. On 10 September 2024, the GEF proposed a list of witnesses that should be heard at the hearing.
27. On 11 September 2024, the Respondents informed the Panel that they had submitted an appeal against the decision on procedural applications dated 9 September 2024. They once more requested an adjournment of the hearing, referring – *inter alia* - to art. 20 of the FIG Code of Discipline.
28. On 12 September 2024, the FIG provided the Panel with the raw data of the scores assigned by the expert judges to the 20 best gymnasts in the RGEC qualification.
29. On 12 September 2024, the GEF requested a dismissal of the Respondents' request for adjournment.
30. On 17 September 2024, the Panel decided to postpone the hearing to 14 and 15 October 2024. As some of the Parties and representatives were not available on this date, the hearing was again postponed to 13 and 14 December 2024. The Panel further informed the Parties of the witnesses it intended to hear and provided procedural instructions regarding the witnesses and interpretation. It indicated that a detailed schedule would be issued once it was determined which witnesses required interpretation.



*Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d'Éthique de la Gymnastique*

Disciplinary Commission

31. The Parties confirmed the availability of their respective witnesses. In its letter from 4 October 2024, the GEF informed the Panel that it intended to call an expert if the Panel intended to discuss in detail any element of the FIG report/review or the Code of Points and that the FIG intended to attend the hearing and to be accompanied by an expert. The Respondents replied that in the case expert evidence was required it should be provided a written expert report. The Respondents asserted that there was no basis for the FIG to appoint an expert to accompany its representative at the hearing.
32. On 16 October 2024, the Appeal Tribunal declared inadmissible the appeal made against the Disciplinary Commission's decisions not to stay the proceedings and not to adjourn the hearing as well as the decision concerning the date and duration of the hearing. Additionally, it rejected the appeal regarding the decision not to summon the other members of the Superior Jury and of the Judges Panel.
33. On 12 November 2024, the Panel welcomed the FIG to attend the hearing on the merits and informed the Parties that it did not deem it necessary to hear an expert on regulations of the RG Code of Points.
34. In preparation for the hearing, the Panel submitted an agenda and amended it once. The Panel and the Parties exchanged correspondence on technical matters concerning the hearing.
35. On 13 and 14 December 2024, the Panel held the hearing on the merits, in the presence of the parties and their representatives. The GEF was represented by its Director, Mr. Alex McLin, and Joseph Hage Aaronson LLP, together with Mr. Nick De Marco KC of Blackstone Chambers, acted for Ms. Trikomiti and European Gymnastics. The Panel heard the following witnesses: Elena Aliprandi, Isabelle de Cossio, Alexandra Piscupescu, Anna Mrozinska and Orane Suter (on behalf of the GEF) and Talia Abduramanova, Hristiana Todorova, Elisa Bedoschvili, Reljin Tatic and Irina Deleanu (on behalf of the Respondents). Evangelia Trikomiti rendered a party declaration.

III. Jurisdiction

36. Under art. 19 of the FIG 2019 Statutes, the GEF has jurisdiction for conducting disciplinary proceedings under the FIG Code of Discipline that are subject to FIG rules.
37. Any infringement of the Statutes, Rules and Regulations, Policies and/or Procedures, as well as of the principles of integrity and sports fairness by the FIG member Federations, gymnasts, officials (judges, coaches, medical staff or others) or by members of the FIG Authorities is liable to sanctions provided for by the FIG Statutes and the FIG Code of Discipline (art. 3 of the Code of Discipline).
38. The allegations concern a FIG approved competition. Ms. Trikomiti is a FIG breveted judge and therefore subject to the FIG Rules. The Parties did not object to the jurisdiction of the GEF Disciplinary Commission.



**Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d'Éthique de la Gymnastique**

Disciplinary Commission

39. As a consequence, the Disciplinary Commission has jurisdiction to decide in this case.

Burden and standard of proof

40. According to art. 18 of the Code of Discipline, the Gymnastics Ethics Foundation shall have the burden of establishing that an infringement of this Code has occurred. The standard of proof in all matters under this Code shall be the balance of probabilities (a standard that implies that on the preponderance of the evidence it is more likely than not that an infringement of this Code has occurred).

41. There is no requirement for a disciplinary authority to apply a different standard of proof for match-fixing offences. That must also apply to cases of score manipulation, since the severity of score manipulation offences is comparable to match-fixing practices. Applying the “preponderance of the evidence” standard does not violate any rules of national or international public policy (CAS 2011/A/2490).

IV. Applicable Law

42. Pursuant to art. 32 of the FIG Statutes, the GEF shall manage disciplinary proceedings in accordance with the FIG Rules.

43. Pursuant to art. 1 of the FIG CoD, *“in the absence of a specific provision in this Code, in the WADA Code or in other disciplinary provisions of the FIG Rules, the Disciplinary Authority shall rule according to the general principles set out in this Code and according to the general principles of justice, fairness and equality. It shall apply the general principles of Swiss law, and principles acknowledged internationally”*.

V. Position of the Parties and Requests for Relief

44. The Panel does not provide an exhaustive list of the Parties’ contentions, but, rather, a summary of the Parties’ main arguments. In considering and deciding upon the Parties’ claims, the Panel has accounted for and carefully considered all the submissions made and evidence adduced by the Parties.



*Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d’Ethique de la Gymnastique*

Disciplinary Commission

A. GEF

45. The GEF alleges that the alleged behaviour of Ms. Trikomiti (see section II(A) above) infringes the above-mentioned rules.
46. The GEF did not only receive allegations from the involved Polish Gymnastics Federation, but also from several members of the Judges Panel.
47. Almost all witnesses – which were all reliable – said that they were shocked by what happened at the RGEC. Each of them contacted the GEF for the very first time to report on the unprecedented situation they had witnessed. All confirmed that the competition went smoothly until the three contenders for the Olympic quota stepped in.
48. The number of blocked scores on Ms. Lewinska, in particular on the ball exercise where all judges panels were blocked, was exceptional. Ms. Trikomiti did not explain the reasons for the blocks, but intervened in the scores in favour of Ms. Tugolukova or against Ms. Lewinska. She was even asked by one of the Members of the Superior Jury to stop and she instructed Smart Scoring staff to enter the score when the Estonian judge refused to change her score.
49. The standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.
50. The proceeding is not about a “field of play” decision, as the matter is simply about an infringement of the FIG Rules for undue interference in the work of the judges and the results of a competition. Nevertheless, the FIG had rejudged the routines and concluded that Ms. Lewinska should have been placed better than Ms. Tugolukova and thus should have obtained the Olympic quota place.
51. Ms. Trikomiti should be sanctioned at an absolute minimum with a 6 years suspension and the annulment of her FIG Judge Brevet and/or coach certificate.
52. European Gymnastics is liable for the offence committed by Ms. Trikomiti pursuant to art. 4 of the FIG Code of Discipline and should be ordered to pay €10,000 for the reimbursement of the GEF’s investigative costs.

B. The Respondents

53. The Respondents’ submissions can be summarized as following.
54. The charges are flawed and should be dismissed. The GEF investigations are incomplete and the GEF’s witnesses unreliable. The proceeding was premature.
55. Blocking is common and the fact that Ms. Lewinska had a number of scores blocked does not mean there was interference or manipulation with the judging or the operation of the blocking system. Across the entirety of the Championships, 229 out of a total 684 exercises featured one



Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d'Éthique de la Gymnastique

Disciplinary Commission

or more blocked scores. The high number of blocks that occurred throughout the Championships is simply a result of the fact that the Code of Points is open to diverging interpretations and applications by different judges, on subjective grounds.

56. Ms. Trikomiti did not interfere with or manipulate the scoring of the RGEC and has not infringed any of the applicable rules in relation to the judging, scoring, blocking and otherwise governance of the Championships. Although she was not obliged to do so, she did not judge Ms. Lewinska, Ms. Tugolukova and Ms. Lytra herself, leaving it to the TC vice-president, Ms. Aliprandi.
57. Ms. Tugolukova achieved the Olympic quota, rather than Ms. Lewinska, because on the basis of legitimate interpretations of the Code of Points applied by qualified and experienced Superior Jury members, Ms. Tugolukova was entitled to receive and did receive higher scoring for her performances.
58. The GEF witnesses had apparent biases and grudges that render their evidence unreliable; and in any event the contents of the statements contain serious inaccuracies.
59. It is implausible to suggest that Ms. Trikomiti would have thrown away an illustrious and longstanding judging career by interfering and manipulating scoring for the sake of a gymnast (Ms. Tugolukova) with whom she had no real connection, based purely on a shared nationality.
60. A number of (reliable) witnesses confirm that the RGEC were held in a normal way.
61. The FIG report undermines the GEF's allegations, since it concluded that there was no manipulation or deliberate interference that resulted in 'under-scoring' of Ms. Lewinska, but it suggests that there was widespread "over-scoring".
62. In any event, there is no basis upon which European Gymnastics could or should be held liable.
63. The Respondents seek the dismissal of all charges against them, an order requiring a public statement to be made by GEF, to be published and maintained on GEF's website, explaining the dismissal of the charges and apologizing for the reputationally-damaging allegations that were made in support of the charges and an order that GEF pay the Respondents their costs of having had to defend the charges.



VI. Merits

A. Analysis of the Charges against Ms. Trikomiti

The RG scoring system

64. A RG Judges Panel consists of 12 judges, two judges for Difficulty of Body (DB), two judges for Difficulty of Apparatus (DA), four judges for Artistry (A) and four judges for Execution (E). The DB judges and the DA judges give a common DB and DA score respectively. These scores are added. Each of the E judges and each of the A judges gives their individual score. The highest and the lowest scores are eliminated and the remaining two scores averaged. The D score, the E score and the A score are added and build the final score.
65. In each Panel, there are several supervisors, two for DB, two for DA, one for A and one for E. The supervisors submit their scores (DB and DA one common score respectively) without knowing the Panel scores. If the difference between the supervisor's score and the Panel's score is too large, the scores are automatically blocked. In this case, the Superior Jury decides on the score in question.
66. At the RGEC, the scoring computer system was managed by Smart Scoring. If a score is blocked, the Smart Scoring technical secretaries will await instructions from the President or the President's assistant and act according to these instructions (Aida Shaliyeva – R-WS08).
67. The scores can also be blocked manually. This feature of the Smart Scoring system was not used at the RGEC (Aida Shaliyeva – R-WS08).
68. If a gymnast (or her coach) is not satisfied with the score, she can submit an inquiry. In this case, the Superior Jury rejudges the routine and may change the score.
69. The scores for Rhythmic Gymnastics are – at least in a certain way – subjective, since it is not possible to take objective measurements, such as meters, seconds etc. If – as outlined by the Respondents – the RG Code of Points permits differing interpretations and/or applications or if – as alleged by the GEF – Ms. Tugolukova was overscored, is not relevant for this proceeding. The relevant issue is if Ms. Trikomiti deliberately manipulated scores.

The Panels at the RGEC

70. The Panels at the relevant days (qualification days) of the RGEC were composed as following (Exhibit GEF_08):



Gymnastics Ethics Foundation Fondation d'Ethique de la Gymnastique

Disciplinary Commission

President TRIKOMITI Evangelia EG
President Assistant ALIPRANDI Elena EG

Function	Name	NOC Code
SJDB1	TODOROVA Hristiana	EG
SJDB2	PISCUPESCU Alexandra	EG
SJDA1	DE COSSIO Isabelle	EG
SJDA2	BEDOSHVILI Eliso	EG
SJE1	RELJIN TATIC Milena	SRB
SJE2	RELJIN TATIC Milena	SRB
SJA1	ABDURAMANOVA Talia	UZB
SJA2	ABDURAMANOVA Talia	UZB
DB1	PITKANEN Saila	FIN
DB2	FORNIE GARCIA Monica	ESP
DA1	MLEJNKOVA Blanka	CZE
DA2	NICOLAEVA Maria	MDA
A1	DAVIDOV Regina	ISR
A2	ABDUSALIMOVA Nigar	AZE
A3	LEANDRO Catarina	POR
A4	SVIRINA Anna	ARM
E1	FILIPOVA Filipa Ivanova	BUL
E2	VICHNIAKOVA Oksana	LUX
E3	MITROI Adriana Cecilia	ROU
E4	MOTOLIKOVA Ivana	SVK
L1	LODHI Aksana	SWE
L2	TRIKOMITI Chrystalleni	CYP
T	STARCEVIC BOSNAR Mirjana	CRO
RJ	MLEJNKOVA Blanka	CZE
R	FOSTER Maria	GBR

Function	Name	NOC Code
SJDB1	PISCUPESCU Alexandra	EG
SJDB2	TODOROVA Hristiana	EG
SJDA1	BEDOSHVILI Eliso	EG
SJDA2	DE COSSIO Isabelle	EG
SJE1	RELJIN TATIC Milena	SRB
SJE2	RELJIN TATIC Milena	SRB
SJA1	ABDURAMANOVA Talia	UZB
SJA2	ABDURAMANOVA Talia	UZB
DB1	IEROMINA Nataliia	UKR
DB2	AGNOLUCCI Emanuela	ITA
DA1	RODINA Irina	BEL
DA2	SCHUCH Marion	AUT
A1	KOBALADZE Bella	GEO
A2	DEUTSCH-LAZSANYI Erika	HUN
A3	LHER Catherine	FRA
A4	DEMIRAY Nevin Sevinc	TUR
E1	SUTER Orane	SUI
E2	MACKONIENE Sigita	LTU
E3	PALLARES Anna	AND
E4	PANTAZIDOU Efthymia	GRE
L1	LODHI Aksana	SWE
L2	TRIKOMITI Chrystalleni	CYP
T	CARLSEN Tina	NOR
RJ	RODINA Irina	BEL
R	MROZINSKA Anna	POL

President TRIKOMITI Evangelia EG
President Assistant ALIPRANDI Elena EG

Function	Name	NOC Code
SJDB1	TODOROVA Hristiana	EG
SJDB2	PISCUPESCU Alexandra	EG
SJDA1	DE COSSIO Isabelle	EG
SJDA2	BEDOSHVILI Eliso	EG
SJE1	RELJIN TATIC Milena	SRB
SJE2	RELJIN TATIC Milena	SRB
SJA1	ABDURAMANOVA Talia	UZB
SJA2	ABDURAMANOVA Talia	UZB
DB1	PITKANEN Saila	FIN
DB2	STARCEVIC BOSNAR Mirjana	CRO
DA1	SUTER Orane	SUI
DA2	BUTT Sareena	GER
A1	RODINA Irina	BEL
A2	VICHNIAKOVA Oksana	LUX
A3	BESTSASTNAJA Natalja	EST
A4	TRIKOMITI Chrystalleni	CYP
E1	KOBALADZE Bella	GEO
E2	CARLSEN Tina	NOR
E3	FOSTER Maria	GBR
E4	MITROI Adriana Cecilia	ROU
L1	LEANDRO Catarina	POR
L2	ABDUSALIMOVA Nigar	AZE
T	SVIRINA Anna	ARM
RJ	SUTER Orane	SUI
R	FORNIE GARCIA Monica	ESP

Function	Name	NOC Code
SJDB1	PISCUPESCU Alexandra	EG
SJDB2	TODOROVA Hristiana	EG
SJDA1	BEDOSHVILI Eliso	EG
SJDA2	DE COSSIO Isabelle	EG
SJE1	RELJIN TATIC Milena	SRB
SJE2	RELJIN TATIC Milena	SRB
SJA1	ABDURAMANOVA Talia	UZB
SJA2	ABDURAMANOVA Talia	UZB
DB1	IEROMINA Nataliia	UKR
DB2	NIKITINA Tatjana	LAT
DA1	DAVIDOV Regina	ISR
DA2	MROZINSKA Anna	POL
A1	MLEJNKOVA Blanka	CZE
A2	VAN DEN BERG Martine	NED
A3	PALLARES Anna	AND
A4	LODHI Aksana	SWE
E1	FILIPOVA Filipa Ivanova	BUL
E2	MOTOLIKOVA Ivana	SVK
E3	MANCIC Jasmina	SRB
E4	YAKUBOUSKAYA Alena	SLO
L1	LEANDRO Catarina	POR
L2	ABDUSALIMOVA Nigar	AZE
T	AGNOLUCCI Emanuela	ITA
RJ	DAVIDOV Regina	ISR
R	NICOLAEVA Maria	MDA

71. The judges were seated like this (Exhibit R-15):



Gymnastics Ethics Foundation Fondation d'Éthique de la Gymnastique

Disciplinary Commission

length: 18 meters															
LOC Technical (visual, sound, music, lights)															
Scoring 1	Scoring 2	Scoring 3	TV 1	TV 2	Speaker	Speaker	LOC					EG President	EG Director	FIG Guest	
	SJ-A	SJ-E	SJ-OB PISCUPESCU	SJ-OB TRIKOMITI	SM SCORING	SM SCORING	TC PRESIDENT	V-PRESIDENT	SJ-DA (USED)	SJ-DA- IN COURT		DIRECTOR	JUR-APPEAL	JUR-APPEAL	
LINE 2	LINE 2	TIME 2	Jury 2 DA2	Jury 2 DA1	Jury 2 DB2	Jury 2 DB1	Jury 1 DA1	Jury 1 DA2	Jury 1 DB1	Jury 1 DB2	TIME 1	LINE 1	LINE 1	ReserveJudge	ReserveJudge
Jury 2 EA4	Jury 2 ET4	Jury 1 EA4	Jury 1 ET4	Jury 2 EA3	Jury 2 ET3	Jury 1 EA3	Jury 1 ET3	Jury 2 EA2	Jury 2 ET2	Jury 1 EA2	Jury 1 ET2	Jury 2 EA1	Jury 2 ET1	Jury 1 EA1	Jury 1 ET1
16 meters															
Competition carpet															

Ms. Trikomiti's behaviour

72. The most important question is if Ms. Trikomiti set a behaviour that comes up to a manipulation or illegitimate influence on the scores. The Parties' positions are very contrary on that point. The witness statements (as a whole) are not consistent either.
73. The (allegation of) manipulation of scores is always a sensitive matter. It concerns the core of fairness of a competition. That means on the one hand that the statement of score manipulation to a judge is a very severe accusation, even more massive to a TC-President of a continental federation. On the other hand, it is very difficult for other judges to raise such an issue, especially towards a TC-President of a continental federation, since they risk facing hard consequences.
74. In this case, there were mainly two witnesses, Ms. Piscupescu and Ms. Aliprandi, who incriminated Ms. Trikomiti. The first question that arises in such a situation is why these witnesses would accuse Ms. Trikomiti of manipulative behaviour if such conduct had not occurred. The Respondents argue that Ms. Piscupescu harboured resentment towards Ms. Trikomiti stemming from the 2012 London Olympic Games, as Ms. Piscupescu believes Ms. Trikomiti was responsible for her failure to qualify for the Olympic Games. The Panel finds this explanation rather far-fetched. While it is understandable that failing to qualify for the Olympic Games - a pinnacle event for rhythmic gymnasts and athletes in other Olympic sports - can be deeply disappointing, this incident occurred 12 years ago. The Panel does not find it plausible that Ms. Piscupescu would seek revenge for such a distant event. During the hearing, Ms. Piscupescu did not appear to be a resentful, harmed, traumatized, or overly frustrated person. Instead, she came across as confident, though somewhat disappointed by the sequence of events. Her demeanour suggested she had faced significant consequences from the Romanian federation, not only due to her allegations against Ms. Trikomiti, but also as a result of broader issues within her home country. These factors, however, do not substantiate the claim that her testimony was motivated by a



**Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d'Éthique de la Gymnastique**

Disciplinary Commission

personal vendetta against Ms. Trikomiti.

75. The Panel finds no reason to believe that Ms. Aliprandi would provide false testimony. The Respondents insinuated that she might have ambitions to become the new President of the Technical Committee. However, the Respondents did not provide any concrete evidence to support this claim. During the hearing, Ms. Aliprandi testified that she heard Ms. Trikomiti making remarks such as “change”, “the score must be changed”, or “What do you have? Put this”, while observing on her computer that the scores were subsequently lowered. Ms. Aliprandi appeared highly emotional while delivering her witness statement. The Panel had the impression that her distress was genuine and stemmed from her perception of Ms. Trikomiti’s behaviour. Therefore, the Panel does not consider Ms. Aliprandi’s testimony to be dishonest.
76. Furthermore, for the Panel to conclude that both Ms. Aliprandi and Ms. Piscupescu were lying, it would require evidence of a coordinated effort between them to conspire against Ms. Trikomiti. This scenario appears highly improbable.
77. The Panel acknowledges that there were certain inconsistencies in the statements of these two witnesses. For instance, Ms. Aliprandi stated that Ms. Trikomiti stood up and shouted at the judges to change their scores. However, this specific claim was not corroborated by Ms. Piscupescu or any of the other witnesses. The Panel is not convinced that this incident occurred exactly as described by Ms. Aliprandi. Nevertheless, both witnesses confirmed that Ms. Trikomiti instructed the judges to alter their scores. The mere act of instructing the judges to change their scores – particularly given Ms. Trikomiti’s role as President of the Technical Committee – constitutes an act of manipulation.
78. Several other judges, including Ms. de Cossio, Ms. Suter and Ms. Mrozinska (on behalf of the GEF’s witnesses), confirmed that some irregularities occurred during the event, although they did not see or hear precisely what transpired. It should be noted that Ms. Mrozinska was potentially biased, since she was a Polish judge and the Polish gymnast was directly involved. None of these witnesses observed Ms. Trikomiti standing up, as described by Ms. Aliprandi. As previously mentioned, the Panel is not convinced that the incident occurred in the manner Ms. Aliprandi described. Moreover, none of the judges reported hearing anything. This can be attributed to several factors: rhythmic gymnastics competitions are inherently busy environments with gymnasts performing, music playing, audiences cheering, and judges focused on calculating scores. Judges are also often preoccupied with monitoring scores and rankings, particularly those involving their own nation. Consequently, judges may not always be aware of the actions of others, including the President of the Superior Jury.
79. Conversely, other witnesses, such as Ms. Bedoshvili, Ms. Todorova, Ms. Abduramanova and Ms. Tatic, testified that everything proceeded normally and that Ms. Trikomiti did not manipulate any scores. However, the Panel finds these statements to be neither reliable nor consistent. For instance, the Georgian judge, Ms. Bedoshvili, initially denied having received the FIG report but later, during her testimony, admitted that she had, in fact, received the document. Similarly, the Uzbek judge, Ms. Abduramanova, first denied that the GEF had contacted her but subsequently confirmed that she received an email from GEF on 2 July 2024. Finally, the Bulgarian judge, Ms. Todorova, failed to recall when the GEF contacted her or whether she had informed the EG about the incidents in question. These inconsistencies and lapses in memory suggest that the aforementioned witnesses either lacked knowledge of the events or were unwilling to fully



**Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d'Éthique de la Gymnastique**

Disciplinary Commission

disclose what they knew. The Panel recognizes the difficulty for individuals operating within a system where manipulation occurred- at least in this case- to acknowledge or admit such misconduct. This fact is itself a plausible reason for withholding the truth. Furthermore, the Panel observes that these witnesses might have felt pressured to protect their positions within the system or their relationship with the implicated parties, leading to evasive or contradictory statements. The inconsistencies in their testimonies further undermine the reliability of their statements.

80. The Respondents submit that Ms. Trikomiti had no reason to manipulate the scores, as doing so would jeopardize her entire career. They also contend that her only connection to Ms. Tugolukova was their shared nationality. The Panel disagrees with this assessment. First, it must be emphasized that securing an Olympic quota is one of the highest priorities for both athletes and national federations. Judges, as part of national delegations, often perceive themselves as integral members of the team, making it conceivable that they might act in support of their “teammates”. Second, human behaviour is not always rational, and individuals do not always weigh all potential consequences before engaging in inappropriate conduct. Third, Ms. Trikomiti could reasonably have expected that none of the other judges would report her actions. Finally, during the hearing, Ms. Trikomiti appeared evasive and avoided directly answering questions, leaving an impression of untrustworthiness. She had strong motives to present herself as acting appropriately, given the severity of the allegations.
81. One incident that is well-documented pertains to Ms. Panagiota Lytra’s ball routine. The DB Panel initially awarded a score of 10.00 points. The Superior Jury initially submitted a score of 9.50. As the difference between these scores was insufficient to trigger a block (which requires a discrepancy greater than 0.50 points), the score was not blocked. Subsequently, the Superior Jury’s score was altered to 9.00 points, and the DB Panel’s score was also adjusted to 9.00 points, resulting in Ms. Lytra receiving 9.00 points for DB (exhibit R-10; Aida Shaliyeva, R-WS08).
82. The Respondents submit that Ms. Trikomiti did not adjudicate the performances of the three gymnasts competing for the Olympic quota (Lewinska, Lytra, Tugolukova) due to concerns about potential bias and therefore lacked the opportunity to manipulate scores. The Panel is not persuaded by this argument. According to the judging system, the President of the Superior Jury only intervenes in cases of blocked scores or inquiries. However, it is evident that opportunities exist to influence judges, particularly members of the Superior Jury. The Panel finds that such influence was likely exerted during the RGE.
83. For the decision in this disciplinary proceeding, the accuracy of the scores or rankings is not relevant. What matters is whether Ms. Trikomiti influenced the work of the judges in favour of Ms. Tugolukova. Consequently, the FIG expert review is irrelevant to the decision in this case.
84. The Jury of Appeal report (Exhibit R-33) notes significant verbal commentary and posts on social media platforms regarding Ms. Lewinska’s results, particularly concerning the blocking of scores for her routines and the Technical Committee’s handling of these issues. According to the Jury of Appeal, all procedures were conducted correctly and in accordance with the rules. However, the Panel assumes that the Jury of Appeal did not conduct a detailed investigation and instead relied on the report provided by the President of the Superior Jury.
85. Taking all the above circumstances into account, the Panel finds that the core allegations made



Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d’Ethique de la Gymnastique

Disciplinary Commission

by Ms. Aliprandi and Ms. Piscupescu are credible, even if certain incidents may have been described in an exaggerated manner. The Panel sees no reason why these witnesses would falsely accuse Ms. Trikomiti of misconduct. Ms. Trikomiti had compelling reasons to manipulate scores in favour of Ms. Tugolukova, given the significance of an Olympic quota for any national sports federation. Additionally, the witnesses supporting Ms. Trikomiti may have had various motivations to do so. One incident, in particular, is substantiated by screenshots of score changes and the uncontested witness statement of Ms. Shaliyeva.

Conclusion

86. Based on the evidence, including the testimony of ten witnesses, the Panel concludes that it is more likely than not that Ms. Trikomiti influenced the Superior Jury to alter scores in favour of Ms. Tugolukova (or to the detriment of Ms. Lewinska and Ms. Lytra), thereby enabling Ms. Tugolukova to secure the Olympic quota.

B. Legal discussion

i. Field of Play Doctrine

87. According to the field of play principle, a decision should not be reviewed by disciplinary authorities if it is demonstrated to be a decision made on the playing field by judges, referees, umpires and other officials, who are responsible for applying the rules of a particular game. This principle seeks to avoid a situation in which arbitrators are asked to substitute their judgement for that of a judge, referee, umpire or other official, on a decision taken in the course of a competition that relates to a sporting activity governed by the rules of a particular game. Any challenge of the assessment of difficulty on a performance, of artistry and execution – including the results of the performances – are matters within the doctrine of “field of play” (CAS OG 24-15).

88. However, the Panel does not have to deal with a field of play decision, since the Panel is not requested to change the results of the competition. The issue the Panel has to deal with is about sanctions for the manipulation of scores. This doesn’t fall under the principle of field of play.

89. For this reason, the Panel rejects the Respondents’ allegations of being the present matter a field of play decision.

ii. Manipulation

90. According to art. 2 let. g) of the FIG Code of Ethics, the FIG members officials, judges and participants of FIG events are not permitted to demonstrate undue pressure or influence the vote or the direction of decisions made in the FIG, and especially must avoid any cooperation sought by influencing the work and evaluation of the judges.



Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d’Ethique de la Gymnastique

Disciplinary Commission

91. According to Section I of the FIG Code of Conduct, all participants in the sport commit to uphold the highest principles of fair play on and off the training and competition field and accept the results of competition with dignity. Section II ch. 3. states that the judge and the official commit to

- Absolute fairness, impartiality, and consistency in all judging situations.
- Present themselves for an assigned function well prepared and conduct all duties with professionalism, competence and courtesy.
- Work in a spirit of cooperation and respect with other officials and event organizers.
- Provide input and feedback in a constructive and positive manner, when requested, at the appropriate time and place.
- Always uphold as first priority the physical, psychological and mental well-being and integrity of the athlete.
- Report to the appropriate authorities any individuals who are accepting bribes, or engaged in the manipulation of competition results, or any other fraudulent or illicit activities.

92. The Introduction of the FIG General Judges Rules 2022-2024 rule that judges officiating at competitions have to

- maintain integrity of all decisions, showing no preference or bias
- possess competence to apply the Code of Points and other rules of the FIG
- demonstrate good moral and ethical behaviour
- show respect to others by being punctual and respecting all rules
- respect the judges’ oath

93. According to art. 7.12.1 of the FIG Technical Regulations, the following oath shall be delivered by a judge in person or virtually during the opening ceremony of the World Championships, and other important international events:

“In the name of all the judges and officials, I promise that we shall officiate in these World Championships (or any other official FIG Event) with complete impartiality, respecting and abiding by the rules which govern them, in the true spirit of sportsmanship.”

Sporting justice, ethics and honesty are the basis of a fair judgment.

If a judge does not abide by his or her oath, he or she incurs the risk of being sanctioned as provided for by the Statutes and the Code of Discipline. The judge in question may be denounced to the GEF Disciplinary Commission by the TC. These provisions shall also be applicable to the elected members of the TCs and the Jury of Appeal who have not abided by their duty of neutrality, respect and the application of the rules and the COP.

The members of the FIG EC must respect and uphold the respect of the sporting ethics by assuring that all the gymnasts/athletes be judged fairly.



Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d'Éthique de la Gymnastique

Disciplinary Commission

94. By influencing the Superior Jury to alter the scores in favour of Ms. Tugolukova (or in disadvantage of Ms. Lewinska and Ms. Lytra), Ms. Trikomiti breached all the named regulations, namely art. 2 let. g of the FIG Code of Ethics, Section I and II of the FIG Code of Conduct, the FIG General Judges Rules and art. 7.12.1 of the FIG Technical Regulations, including the judges' oath.

iii. Liability of European Gymnastics

95. According to art. 4 of the Code of Discipline, the federations are also liable for the behaviour of their members, gymnasts, judges and officials as well as for any other person assigned by them to officiate during a competition. European Gymnastics is already liable according to that regulation.
96. Ms. Trikomiti is not only a member of European Gymnastics. She is the President of the Technical Committee for Rhythmic Gymnastics, one of the governing bodies of European Gymnastics, and member of the Executive Committee. European Gymnastics is therefore per se liable for her behaviour.

iv. Sanctions

97. The GEF requests for Ms. Trikomiti a period of ineligibility of 6 years of all gymnastics related activities, starting on the date of notification, and the annulation of her Judge Brevet and coach certificate. European Gymnastics should be ordered the payment of €10,000 for the reimbursement of the GEF's investigative costs.
98. The Respondents submit that – if the Panel should conclude that there was any violation of relevant norms – no sanction should be imposed neither on Ms. Trikomiti nor on European Gymnastics.
99. According to art. 25 of the Code of Discipline, the Disciplinary Authority shall set out the type and the scope of the disciplinary sanctions, in accordance with the FIG Statutes and regulations, by considering both the objective and subjective elements of the infringement. The sanctions imposed shall take into account mitigating and aggravating circumstances.
100. Pursuant to art. 34 of the FIG Statutes, disciplinary measures which can be imposed amongst others on a Member Federation, on a legal entity or an individual are the following:
1. the warning
 2. the blame
 3. the suspension of the Member Federation or the person concerned for one or more official FIG events and other international events
 4. the proscription to take part in the FIG events and other international events for one given or unspecified duration



*Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d'Éthique de la Gymnastique*

Disciplinary Commission

5. the exclusion of any participation in the FIG activities and other international events for one given or unspecified duration
 6. the demotion of functions
 7. the withdrawal of a honorary title or distinction
 8. the cancellation of the brevets or diplomas awarded
 9. the financial fine
 10. the suspension for one or more functions of a person elected within one of the FIG Governing Bodies and/or of a continental Union for one given or unspecified duration
 11. the suspension of a Member Federation for one given or unspecified duration
 12. the expulsion of a Member Federation for one given or unspecified duration
 13. the exclusion of an FIG person
 14. the cancellation of results of a competition
 15. the obligation to restore the financial benefits and prizes received
 16. the disciplinary measures resulting from the anti-doping regulations
 17. or any other sanction which could be proposed by the Disciplinary Commission of the Gymnastics Ethics Foundation.
101. Score manipulation is one of the most severe violations of FIG rules, concerning the core of the competition system of gymnastics events and damages the reputation of sport. Ms. Trikomiti takes the highest position in Rhythmic Gymnastics in Europe. She should grant neutrality and unbiased judging, serving as an example for all the judges in Europe. By manipulating the scores in favour for her gymnast, she showed lack of sportsmanship and severe unfairness. She helped “her” gymnast to qualify for the Paris 2024 Olympic Games, leaving behind an athlete that did not reach this goal. These aggravating circumstances have to be considered by imposing a proper sanction.
102. On the other hand, Ms. Trikomiti already faced a loss of reputation and missed the Paris 2024 Olympic Games. Up to this incident, she served as a judge, member and now president of the RGTC in an irreproachable way.
103. The Panel believes that a hard sanction is necessary in this case, also to show that the Disciplinary Commission does not accept any undue pressure or influence on judges to manipulate any scores, since such practices gravely damage the whole sport of gymnastics. It concludes that a suspension for a time of four years and the annulment of the judges brevet is appropriate in this case. As the allegations in this case do not directly affect any coaching activities, the Panel does not deem it necessary to annul the FIG coaching license. On this point the GEF’s request is rejected.
104. Regarding European Gymnastics, in accordance with art. 27, para. 2 of the Code of Discipline, the Panel considers a contribution of €8,000 for the reimbursement of the GEF’s investigative costs appropriate.



v. Findings

ON THESE GROUNDS

The GEF Disciplinary Commission issues the following decision:

- 1. Ms. Evangelia Trikomiti has been found guilty of breaking the FIG Code of Ethics, FIG Code of Conduct, the FIG General Judges' Rules and the Judge's Oath by manipulating the scores of the 2024 Rhythmic Gymnastics European Championships.**
- 2. Ms. Evangelia Trikomiti is declared ineligible for a period of 4 years of all gymnastics related activities excluding coaching activities, starting on the date of notification of this decision. The period of provisional suspension (30 days) shall be deducted from this period.**
- 3. Ms. Evangelia Trikomiti's FIG Judge Brevet is annulled.**
- 4. European Gymnastics is held responsible for the offence committed by Ms. Evangelia Trikomiti pursuant to art. 4 of the FIG Code of Discipline.**
- 5. European Gymnastics is ordered the payment of €8,000 for the reimbursement of the GEF's investigative costs.**
- 6. All other motions or prayers for relief are dismissed.**

VII. Publication

105. Art. 23 of the Code of Discipline provides that final decisions shall be published in full, partly or in short on the FIG website or in the FIG official publication.
106. The Panel confirms that the decision will be published.



Gymnastics Ethics Foundation
Fondation d'Éthique de la Gymnastique

Disciplinary Commission

Lausanne, 6 February 2025

Mr. Thomas Hayn, Panel President

Ms. Melanie Schärer, Panel Member

Mr. Daniele Moro, Panel Member



Gymnastics Ethics Foundation Fondation d'Éthique de la Gymnastique

Disciplinary Commission

Notice of Appeal

Article 30 of the FIG Code of Discipline - Appeal

With the exception of decisions and sanctions rendered in connection with the FIG Anti-Doping Rules and the WADA Code including its international standards, which may be appealed directly to the CAS, and unless provided otherwise in specific provisions, only the decisions rendered by the Disciplinary Commission may be appealed to the Appeal Tribunal.

Only the Parties directly involved in the proceedings shall be eligible to lodge an appeal to the Appeal Tribunal.

Upon request of a majority of the Executive Committee or of the FIG President, the FIG shall in all cases be eligible to lodge an appeal. The appeal shall be lodged by the FIG Secretary General. Likewise the majority of the Council of the Gymnastics Ethics Foundation or its President shall be eligible to lodge an appeal in all cases. Appeals of the Gymnastics Ethics Foundation shall be lodged by its Director.

In order to be admissible, the appeal shall be lodged in writing and contain:

- the factual argument
- the reasons for the appeal
- the submission of any and all means of proof relied upon by the Appellant or an offer to submit any and all means of proof (such as the request for the hearing of witnesses or the request for an independent expert)
- the request of a hearing if wished so by the Appellant
- the conclusions of the Appellant

If the Appellant wishes to call witnesses or experts, a hearing shall be held.

Once his/her statement of the case is submitted, the Appellant shall not be authorised to produce new means of proof unless he/she justifies that he/she has not been able to do so for reasons beyond his/her control or his/her behest. The Appeal Tribunal may automatically conduct the necessary investigations.

The appeal shall be signed by the Appellant and sent in writing to the Director of the Gymnastics Ethics Foundation to the attention of the Appeal Tribunal within 21 days from the notification of the decision rendered by the Disciplinary Commission.

Should the appeal be submitted by email it shall be admissible provided that it contains an electronic signature officially certified and dated via a secure server.

Should the appeal be sent by mail, it shall be delivered to a Swiss post office at the latest by midnight of the last day of the time limit or be delivered at the Office of the Gymnastics Ethics Foundation, at the attention of the Appeal Tribunal during its usual opening hours not later than the last day of the time limit. The Appellant is responsible for showing proof, within a time limit to be determined by the President of the Appeal Tribunal, that his appeal has been lodged in due time, otherwise, the appeal shall be considered inadmissible.

In order for the appeal to be admissible, the Appellant shall transfer in advance the expenses of CHF 5,000.- onto the account of the Gymnastics Ethics Foundation at the same time the appeal is lodged or at the latest by the end of the appeal deadline. This amount shall be refunded to the Appellant if his appeal is granted. It shall be kept by the Gymnastics Ethics Foundation if the appeal is considered inadmissible or is fully or partly rejected. The Gymnastics Ethics Foundation is exempt from the obligation to pay the expenses in advance for its appeal.