



Arbitration CAS 2004/A/725 United States Olympic Committee (USOC) v. International Olympic Committee (IOC) & International Association of Athletics Federation (IAAF), award of 20 July 2005

Panel: Mr. Kaj Hobér (Sweden), President; Mr. L. Yves Fortier QC (Canada); Mr. David A.R. Williams QC (New Zealand)

Athletics

Disqualification of a relay team further to the suspension of an individual member of the team
Interpretation of the IAAF Rules

- 1. Rule 59.4 of the IAAF Rules in force at the time of the Sydney Games concerns the disqualification, ineligibility and annulment of performance results of *individual* athletes, in cases where an athlete has been found guilty of a doping offence; it does not concern teams or team results. One should not take a rule that plainly concerns individual ineligibility and the annulment of individual results, and then stretch and complement and construe it in order that it may be said to govern the results achieved by teams.**
- 2. Clarity and predictability of the rules are required so that the entire sport community are informed of the normative system in which they live, work and compete, which requires at the very least that they be able to understand the meaning of rules and the circumstances in which those rules apply.**

This case, in its essence, concerns the interpretation of relevant IAAF Rules and their application to five members of the gold medal-winning U.S.A. team (the “U.S.A. team”) in the men's 4 x 400m relay event at the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games (the “relay event”). It is a most peculiar case, arising in most unusual circumstances.

As explained more fully in this Award, the results of the relay event and the fate of the medals awarded to the U.S.A. team at the 2000 Sydney Games have, five years later, been called into question as a result of two occurrences.

First, on 28 June 2004, a Panel of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) found that a Doping Appeals Board of USA Track & Field (USATF), the national federation that governs the sport of athletics in the United States of America, had misdirected itself and reached an erroneous conclusion when, on 10 July 2000, it exonerated Mr. Jerome Young (a sixth member of the U.S.A. team, who is not one of the Appellants in this arbitration) of having committed a doping offence on 26 June 1999, just prior to the Sydney Games. The CAS Panel found that Mr. Young had

committed a doping offence, that the resulting period of ineligibility extended through the Sydney Games, and that Mr. Young should therefore not have participated in those Games (CAS 2004/A/628, award of 28 June 2004).

Second, on 18 July 2004, the IAAF Council determined that “as a consequence of Jerome Young’s ineligibility to have competed at the Sydney Olympic Games in 2000 [by virtue of having committed a doping offence on 26 June 1999], the result of the USA Men’s 4 x 400m relay event is annulled and the final placings are revised accordingly”.

It is the subject matter of the second of these decisions – that is, whether under IAAF Rules in force at the time of the Sydney Games, the results of the relay event should be annulled and the final placings revised accordingly – that is the primary issue in the present appeal.

First Appellant, USOC, is the body to which all US Olympic sports federations are affiliated and is responsible, among other duties, for the selection and registration of athletes in the Olympic Games. USOC has its seat in Colorado Springs, Colorado, U.S.A.

Second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth Appellants, Messrs. Michael Johnson, Antonio Pettigrew, Angelo Taylor, Alvin Harrison and Calvin Harrison (the “Athletes”) are five of the six athletes who were members of the U.S.A. team awarded gold medals in the 4 x 400 men’s relay event at the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games. The sixth member of that team, Mr. Jerome Young, is not a party in these proceedings.

First Respondent, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) is the governing body of the Olympic Movement. One of its missions is to ensure the regular celebration of the Olympic Games. The IOC has its seat in Lausanne, Switzerland.

Second Respondent, the International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF) is the international federation that governs the sport of athletics throughout the world. The IAAF has its seat in the Principality of Monaco. On 18 July 2004, the IAAF Council made the decision (the “IAAF decision”) that is the subject of the present appeal.

IAAF Rule 59.4 is in the following terms:

If an athlete is found to have committed a doping offence and this is confirmed after a hearing or the athlete waives his right to a hearing, he shall be declared ineligible. In addition, where testing was conducted in a competition, the athlete shall be disqualified from that competition and the result amended accordingly. His ineligibility shall begin from the date of suspension. Performances achieved from the date on which the sample was provided shall be annulled.

(emphasis added)

Bye-law 1.2 to Rule 57 of the Olympic Charter provides:

1. Technical provisions relating to IFs at the Olympic Games:
The IFs have the following rights and responsibilities:

[...]

1.2 To establish the final results and ranking of Olympic competitions.

In addition, it is relevant to note articles 6.11 (d) and (e) of the IAAF Constitution in force as from 1 November 2003 (the version of the IAAF Constitution that is relevant here), which provide:

The Council's powers shall include the following:

[...]

- (d) to make decisions in urgent matters relating to all Rules. Any such decisions may be notified to the members by the IAAF Office and shall be reported to the next Congress.
- (e) to make decisions regarding the interpretation of the Rules. Any such decisions may be notified to the members by the IAAF Office and shall be reported to the next Congress.

(emphasis added)

Although this case concerns essentially a pure question of law, an appreciation of its lengthy and complicated history is relevant to an understanding both of the context in which the present appeal arises and of the issues addressed in this Award. That history has been thoroughly traversed by the parties in their written and oral submissions, and is summarized here.

On 26 June 1999, Mr. Young provided a urine sample while competing at the United States National Outdoor Championships in Eugene, Oregon. The IOC-accredited laboratory in Indianapolis, Indiana reported that the sample was positive for nandrolone metabolites.

On 11 March 2000, a USATF Doping Hearing Panel found Mr. Young guilty of a doping offence. That decision was reversed on 10 July 2000 by a USATF Doping Appeals Board, thus exonerating Mr. Young and rendering him eligible to enter and compete in the Sydney Games. The USATF, IAAF and IOC accordingly allowed Mr. Young to compete in the Sydney Games as a member of the U.S.A. team, which eventually won the gold medal.

During the Sydney Games, Mr. Young competed in the semi-final heat for the relay event, on 29 September 2000. He did not compete in the final race on 30 September 2000, which four members of the U.S.A. team (Michael Johnson, Antonio Pettigrew, Alvin Harrison and Calvin Harrison) won.

There is no evidence and there has been no suggestion that any member of the U.S.A. team (including Mr. Young) used or ingested any prohibited substance or committed any doping offence during the Sydney Games. Nor is there any evidence, and there has been no suggestion, that any member of the U.S.A. team even knew of Mr. Young's case at the time.

The reason for this lay in USATF's rules (since amended) concerning athletes' privacy and the confidentiality of information pertaining to doping cases in which athletes were ultimately exonerated. In July 2002, the IAAF submitted its concerns about the USATF's confidentiality policy to arbitration before a CAS Panel. On 10 January 2003, that Panel held that although IAAF Rules

did obligate the USATF to disclose information regarding its drug tests to the IAAF, and that information should have been disclosed, given the passage of time and the equities, including the IAAF's familiarity with the USATF rules in question, the USATF should not in the circumstances be required to disclose the identity, or any information about the drug tests, of athletes who had been exonerated¹.

In August 2003 – three years after the Sydney Games – the United States media (*Los Angeles Times*) reported Mr. Young's June 1999 doping offense and subsequent exoneration by the USATF Doping Appeals Board.

On 30 September 2003, the IOC Executive Board formed a Disciplinary Commission to investigate the circumstances surrounding Mr. Young's entry and participation in the Sydney Games.

In early February 2004, USATF released the unredacted decision of its Appeals Board that had exonerated Mr. Young and sent it to the USOC. The USOC forwarded the decision to the IOC and IAAF.

On 18 February 2004, the IAAF referred the matter to arbitration before the CAS, requesting that the decision exonerating Mr. Young be overturned.

On 29 June 2004, a CAS Panel ruled, *inter alia*, that (1) the USATF Doping Appeals Board had acted erroneously in overturning the 11 March 2000 decision finding Mr. Young guilty of a doping offence; (2) Mr. Young should have been ineligible to compete in international competition for the 2-year period from 26 June 1999 (the date of his urine sample) to 25 June 2001; and (3) Mr. Young therefore should not have been allowed to compete in the Sydney Games.

On 5 July 2004, the IAAF convened an Extraordinary Council Meeting for 18 July 2004, to consider the action which it should take in the light of the decision in the Jerome Young case and further to the correspondence received from the IOC Disciplinary Commission.

By letter dated 17 July 2004, USATF sent the IAAF a written submission in the matter, stating, *inter alia*, that fairness demanded that Jerome Young alone, and not his innocent teammates, should forfeit the gold medal won by the U.S.A. team.

Two days prior to the Extraordinary Council Meeting, a "Briefing Note to Council" was prepared for the assistance and use of the Council members at their 18 July 2004 meeting (the "IAAF briefing note"). The IAAF briefing note set out the history of the Jerome Young case, the action required of the IAAF Council, the relevant IAAF Rules, and how relevant previous cases had been dealt with.

On 18 July 2004, the Extraordinary Council Meeting was held in Grosseto, Italy.

The IAAF Legal Counsel stated:

[...]

¹ See CAS 2002/O/401, in: REEB M. (ed.), *Digest of CAS Awards III 2001-2003*, The Hague 2004, p. 36 ff.

(x) (...) all the IAAF Council was required to do was to interpret the relevant IAAF Rules in 1999 as regards the consequences of Jerome Young's ineligibility on the USA Relay Team. The IAAF Council was not being asked to reach a decision on the withdrawal of the gold medals of the USA Relay Team Members. This was a matter exclusively for the IOC.

There then ensued a general discussion among Council members. As stated at paragraph 9 of the General Secretary's note:

The broad views of the council were:

(i) That the spirit and intent of the relevant IAAF Rules was to annul all Jerome Young's results in the 2-year period of his ineligibility, including the USA 4x400m Relay Team result at the Sydney Olympic Games.

(ii) That the natural consequence under the relevant IAAF Rules of the annulment of an individual's results was the annulment of any relay result in which the athlete had competed. Every member of a winning relay team is awarded a gold medal whether they participate only in the preliminary rounds or in the final. This shows that a relay is one event composed of the preliminary rounds and a final. If an athlete is ineligible to compete as part of the team in a preliminary round, the team's performance in the overall event must be affected.

[...]

(v) Jerome Young's appearance in the Sydney Games was caused by the fault of USATF; USATF had, [despite reminders from the IAAF Council,] failed to comply with IAAF Rules in notifying the IAAF of its doping decisions; had they done so, Jerome Young would never had been allowed by the IAAF to compete in Sydney.

The IAAF President then summed up the discussion and called for a vote to be taken as to whether the results of the USA team should be modified. In a secret ballot, the meeting voted 16 - 1 in favour of annulling the result (with one abstention). The motion was therefore passed.

On 18 July 2004, the IAAF President wrote to the Secretary of the IOC Disciplinary Commission. His letter reads:

[...]

Further to the request of the IOC Disciplinary Commission by letter dated 2 July 2004, the IAAF Council has interpreted the relevant IAAF Rules that were in force at the time that Mr. Young committed a doping offence on 26 June 1999. Its interpretation is that, as a consequence of Jerome Young's ineligibility to have competed at the Sydney Olympic Games in 2000, the result of the USA Men's 4x400m Relay Team is annulled and the final placings are revised accordingly.

[...]

The present arbitration was commenced by the filing of Appellants' Statement of Appeal with the CAS on 27 September 2004.

The hearing of the appeal took place in London, on 10 May 2005.

LAW

1. As stated by Appellants in their Statement of Appeal, this appeal is brought pursuant to both IAAF Rule 21 (IAAF Handbook 2002-2003) and more particularly, because the matter concerns the Olympic Games, Article 61 of the Olympic Charter, which provides:

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

2. For its part, the IAAF acknowledges that the Athletes, who are the subject of the IAAF decision, have standing to appeal that decision to the CAS in virtue of IAAF Rule 60.13 (IAAF Handbook 2004-2005)². However, the IAAF contends that USOC enjoys no such standing and should be removed as a party to these proceedings. For the reasons set forth below, and in view of the Panel's findings in respect of the substantive issues in this appeal, the IAAF's request that USOC be struck as a party to these proceedings need not be determined; and the Panel thus refrains from doing so.
3. The question to be answered is whether, under IAAF Rules in force at the time of the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games, the results obtained by the U.S.A. team in the relay event should be annulled. It is the unanimous opinion of the Panel that they should not be annulled.
4. IAAF Rule 59.4, which the IAAF puts before the Panel as the principal governing rule in the circumstances, is set out in full above. For ease of reference, it is reproduced here:

If an athlete is found to have committed a doping offence and this is confirmed after a hearing or the athlete waives his right to a hearing, he shall be declared ineligible. In addition, where testing was conducted in a competition, the athlete shall be disqualified from that competition and the result amended accordingly. His ineligibility shall begin from the date of suspension. Performances achieved from the date on which the sample was provided shall be annulled.

² IAAF Rule 60.13 (IAAF Handbook 2004-2005) reads as follows:

Parties entitled to appeal decisions

In any case involving International-Level athletes (or their athlete support personnel) or arising from an International Competition, the following parties shall have the right to appeal a decision to CAS:

- a. the athlete or other person who is the subject of the decision being appealed;
- b. the other party to the case in which the decision was rendered;
- c. the IAAF;
- d. the IOC (where the decision may have an effect on eligibility in relation to the Olympic Games; and
- e. WADA (in doping-related matters only).

5. It was urged upon the Panel with great conviction and eloquence by the IAAF's counsel that IAAF Rule 59.4 provides a clear statement of a rule providing for the annulment of the results of the U.S.A. team in the circumstances of this case – that is, a rule to the effect that *where an athlete tests positive in an earlier competition and is subsequently declared ineligible, and his results from the date of the provision of his sample through to the imposition of his ineligibility are annulled* (as in the case of Mr. Young), *the result of any relay team in which he has competed during such period* (e.g., the results of the U.S.A. team at the Sydney Olympic Games) *shall also be annulled*.
6. The IAAF argues that the express provisions of IAAF Rule 59.4 must be “complemented” by anything which is necessarily to be implied in them, and that they must be construed “purposively”. It maintains that Rule 59.4 is to be complemented, for example, by provisions such as those contained in IAAF Rules 170 (17) and (18), which govern the composition of a relay team and the nature and timing of permitted substitutions to a team. It contends that the annulment of the U.S.A. team's winning results “follows inexorably” from the last sentence of Rule 59.4, which states that “[p]erformances achieved from date the sample was provided shall be annulled,” in that:

There is no distinction drawn between performance in individual or in relay results. Young’s performance in the first round and semi-final stage of the 4 x 400 men’s relay (which occurred ... during his period of ineligibility) are annulled. It follows inexorably that (i) the other results of the squad in which he [Mr. Young] ran (the qualification round squads) are annulled, since the squad had to compete 4 not 3 legs (in qualification) (ii) the results of the squad in which he did not run (the final squad) are also annulled, since that squad's right to participate and participation in other final depended upon the results of the earlier squad being valid.

Alternatively since the word “performances” is not limited to the athlete's own performances it should be construed as applying to the performances of a team in which the athlete participated.
7. More broadly, the IAAF contends that the applicability of the relevant rules in the circumstances of the present case, and the consequent annulment of the results obtained by the U.S.A. team in the relay event is implicit in order to give efficiency to the Olympic Movement Anti-doping Code and related rules. In the submission of the IAAF, “it would be perverse and undermine the force of the Anti-doping Code if results achieved through reliance on an ineligible athlete, whether [results] of the athlete or of his team, should stand”.
8. In sum, the IAAF takes the position that both a purposive and even a literal interpretation of IAAF Rules require that the results of the gold medal-winning U.S.A. team be annulled. The proposition, it says, is straightforward: Jerome Young was ineligible to compete at the Sydney Olympic Games; his results are annulled; therefore the results of the four-some in which he ran must also be annulled; and the results achieved by the four U.S.A. team members who ran in the final race of the relay event must similarly be annulled, since they only made it to the finals due to the results achieved by the U.S.A. team in earlier heats, in which Mr. Young ran. “In team sports,” the IAAF submits (with reference to the CAS award OG 1998/004-005, published in the Digest of CAS Awards I 1986-1998, p. 435ss.), “the chain is no stronger than its weakest link”.

9. As stated above, the argument is not without force or logic. However, in the view of the Panel, even when articulated in its most simple and compelling fashion, its shortcomings are apparent.
10. On its face, Rule 59.4 concerns the disqualification, ineligibility and annulment of performance results of *individual* athletes, in cases where that athlete has been found guilty of a doping offence; it does not concern teams or team results (in fact, as explained below, the IAAF Rules did not contain any express provisions covering the sort of situation at issue in this case until they were amended in 2004-2005.)
11. IAAF Rule 59.4 plainly deals with, and is plainly intended to deal *only* with, the situation of “an athlete” who is found to have committed a doping offence. It speaks to “the athlete” being disqualified and to the period of “his” ineligibility as well as to the annulment of his performances achieved as from the date on which his positive sample was provided.
12. To take a rule that plainly concerns individual ineligibility and the annulment of individual results, and then to stretch and complement and construe it in order that it may be said to govern the results achieved by teams, is the sort of legal abracadabra that lawyers and partisans in the fight against doping in sport can love, but in which athletes should not be required to engage in order to understand the meaning of the rules to which they are subject.
13. In seeking a proper interpretation of relevant IAAF Rules and their application in the circumstances of this case, one returns inevitably to the observations contained in the IAAF briefing note prepared for IAAF Council members in advance of their 18 July 2004 deliberations and decision. Whereas the alleged clarity of the relevant IAAF Rules is much to be doubted, this much *is* crystal clear and is stated, correctly, in the IAAF briefing note: “In the 2000 Rules, there was ... no specific provision for what should happen when a competitor who had been a member of a team (either of a relay team or otherwise) was found guilty of doping”.
14. As explained in the IAAF briefing note, it is not until their amendment in 2004-2005 that IAAF Rules provide expressly for what happens when an athlete who is a member of a relay team is found guilty of doping. According to the briefing note, Rule 39.4 of the 2004-2005 IAAF Rules makes it clear “*for the first time*” that:

[I]f an athlete tests positive in an earlier competition or admits doping (and is subsequently declared ineligible) and his results from the date of the provision of his sample through to the imposition of his suspension or ineligibility are annulled, the result of any relay team in which he has competed during such period shall also be annulled.
15. It is immediately apparent that this is in essence the very rule which the IAAF contends existed, whether literally or by implication, at the time of the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games. This is the rule which it attempts to tease out of IAAF Rule 59.4.

16. In fact, IAAF Rule 39.4 says more than even the IAAF briefing note suggests. While it is true that the 2004-2005 IAAF Rules are the “the first time” that the implication for teams whose members may have committed doping offences is spelled out, Rule 39.4 also introduces the concept of *fairness* as a consideration. It reads as follows:

[W]here an athlete has been declared ineligible under R40 below, all competitive results obtained from the date the positive sample was provided (whether in competition or out of competition) or other anti-doping rule violation occurred, through to the commencement of the period of provisional suspension shall, unless fairness dictates otherwise, be annulled, with all resulting consequences for the athlete (and, where applicable, any team in which the athlete has competed) including the forfeiture of all titles, awards, medals, points and prize and appearance money.

(emphasis added)

17. The relevant IAAF Rules in force at the time of the Sydney Games contained no such “fairness consideration”. And of course, to construe those Rules, in particular Rule 59.4, in the manner contended for by the IAAF in this arbitration would entail an automatic disqualification or annulment of the results of the entire USA team, without any consideration of fairness to the members of that team. In the view of the Panel, the absence of a “fairness consideration” in Rule 59.4 makes it even less likely that it was intended to apply, by implication, to teams as well as to individuals.
18. The IAAF contends that “this is not a Q.³ case”. In a sense, however, this is very much “a Q. case”. Firstly, the clarity of the relevant anti-doping rules related to team results in force at the time of the Sydney Olympic Games is manifestly in doubt. This explains why the main issue before this Panel is, as the IAAF recognises, the merits of the IAAF decision interpreting those rules.
19. Secondly, the principles underlying the approach adopted by the CAS in CAS 94/129 and similar cases cannot be ignored, as the IAAF suggests they should be, on the basis that, because the Athletes were entirely ignorant of their teammate's doping offence (given that he had been exonerated at the time, and that exoneration was not overturned until many years later), their behaviour was in no way affected by those rules or their understanding of them.
20. The rationale for requiring clarity of rules extends beyond enabling athletes in given cases to determine their conduct in such cases by reference to understandable rules. As argued by the Appellants at the hearing, clarity and predictability are required so that the entire sport community are informed of the normative system in which they live, work and compete, which requires at the very least that they be able to understand the meaning of rules and the circumstances in which those rules apply.
21. There was simply no express rule in force at the time of the Sydney Games which provided for the annulment of results obtained by a team, one of whose members later was found to have been ineligible to compete at the time. As became apparent in these proceedings, such a

³ CAS 94/129, published in the Digest of CAS Awards I 1986-1998, p. 187ss.

rule could only be said to have been produced by what the Panel in the CAS 94/129 case referred to as “an obscure process of accretion” – here, as the IAAF would have it, a process of complementation and inference. The Panel consider that the following oft-cited passage from the CAS 94/129 decision is apposite:

The fight against doping is arduous, and it may require strict rule. But the rule-makers and the rule-appliers must begin by being strict with themselves. Regulations that may affect the careers of dedicated athletes must be predictable. They must emanate from duly authorised bodies. They must be adopted in constitutionally proper ways. They should not be the product of an obscure process of accretion. Athletes and officials should not be confronted with a thicket of mutually qualifying or even contradictory rules that can be understood only on the basis of the de facto practice over the course of many years of a small group of insiders.

(emphasis added)

22. In *A.C. v. FINA*,⁴ in which, as in this case, the International Federation in question argued for a “purposive construction” of the relevant rules, the CAS nonetheless granted the Appellant’s appeal in part (as to the sanction). In doing so it cited with approval the approach taken in CAS 94/129 and further stated that the federation in question bore the responsibility:

[T]o take every step to ensure that competitors under their jurisdiction were familiar with all rules, regulations, guidelines and requirements in such a sensitive area as doping control.

[...]

It is important that the fight against doping in sport, national and international, be waged unremittingly. The reasons are well known ... It is equally important that athletes in any sport ... know clearly where they stand. It is unfair if they are to be found guilty of offences in circumstances where they neither knew nor reasonably could have known that what they were doing was wrong (to avoid any doubt we are not to be taken as saying that doping offences should not be offences as a strict liability, but rather that the nature of the offence [as one of strict liability] should be known and understood).

For this purpose, it is incumbent both upon the international and the national federation to keep those within their jurisdiction aware of the precepts of the relevant codes.

(emphasis added)

23. IAAF Rule 59.4 applies plainly to Mr. Young. The same simply cannot be said with respect to the Athletes who are Appellants in this case.
24. For these reasons, the Panel is unanimously of the opinion that the decision taken by the IAAF Council on 18 July 2004 interpreting its rules is incorrect, and should be overturned.

⁴ CAS 96/149, published in the Digest of CAS Awards I 1986-1998, p. 251 at 261-262.

The Panel reaches this conclusion with all due respect to the IAAF Council and its role under the IAAF Constitution as the primary decision-maker regarding the interpretation of its Rules.

25. On the basis of IAAF rules applicable at the time of the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games, the results obtained by the Athletes in the men's 4 x 400m relay event at the Sydney Games shall not be amended. Those results therefore stand. Furthermore, it is the understanding of the Panel that only Jerome Young in the US relay team should be stripped of his gold medal pursuant to the CAS award 2004/A/628 of 28 June 2004.
26. Having so found, the Panel considers it unnecessary for it to consider the other issues raised by the parties in these proceedings. In particular, the Panel considers that there is no need for it to determine, and it refrains from determining:
 - Whether the IAAF has the jurisdiction, power or authority to annul the results of the relay event (the Panel having determined that, even assuming (without deciding) that the IAAF has such jurisdiction, its decision in this case was incorrect);
 - Whether the IAAF decision should be overturned on grounds unrelated to the merits of that decision (for example, whether modification of the results of the relay event is time-barred, or whether the IAAF decision is vitiated by a lack of due process);
 - Whether or not USOC, as distinct from the Athletes, has standing to appeal the IAAF decision.
27. The Panel also refrains from determining, because it need not in the circumstances determine, the IOC's Request for a Stay of the proceedings as against it.

The Court of Arbitration for Sport rules:

1. The appeal filed by Michael Johnson, Antonio Pettigrew, Angelo Taylor, Alvin Harrison and Calvin Harrison on 27 September 2004 is upheld.
2. The IAAF Council decision of 18 July 2004 is hereby overturned.
3. On the basis of IAAF Rules in force and applicable at the time of the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games, the results of the men's 4 x 400m relay event at those Games shall not be amended; those results stand.

(...)