

11 August 2025

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

I. Introduction

1. The International Tennis Integrity Agency (**ITIA**) is the delegated third party, under the World Anti-Doping Code (**Code**), of the International Tennis Federation (**ITF**), the international governing body for the sport of tennis and signatory of the Code. Under the delegation, the ITIA is responsible for the management and administration of anti-doping across professional tennis in accordance with the Tennis Anti-Doping Programme (the **TADP** or the **Programme**), which sets out Code-compliant anti-doping rules applicable to players competing in Covered Events.¹
2. Thomas Fancutt (the **Player**) is a 30-year-old professional tennis player from Brisbane, Australia. He has achieved a career-high ATP singles ranking of 382 and doubles ranking of 107.² By virtue of (among other things) his ATP ranking and participation in Covered Events in 2024, the Player was bound by and required to comply with the TADP at all relevant times.
3. Through an ITIA investigation, the ITIA became aware that in December 2024 the Player may have received an intravenous infusion of more than a total of 100 mL per 12-hour period (a Prohibited Method under category M2.2 of the World Anti-Doping Agency (**WADA**) Prohibited List).
4. Upon further investigation, including information voluntarily provided by the Player including during an interview with the ITIA, it was confirmed that the Player had received the prohibited infusion, and that this infusion did not occur in connection with a Therapeutic Use Exemption or in the course of a hospital treatment, surgical procedure, or clinical diagnostic investigation.
5. As a result, on 3 April 2025, the ITIA charged the Player with the commission of an anti-doping rule violation (**ADRV**) under Article 2.2 of the TADP (copied below), and subsequently proposed certain Consequences based on its analysis of the degree of Fault that the Player bears for the violation:

“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”.
6. The Player has admitted the anti-doping rule violation charged and accepted the Consequences proposed by the ITIA.

¹ Unless specified otherwise, references in this decision to the TADP are to the 2024 edition. The substantive rules of the 2023 TADP and the procedural rules of the 2025 TADP apply to this case (see 2025 TADP Article 1.5). Any defined term denoted by an initial capital letter that is not otherwise defined in this decision has the meaning given to it in the applicable TADP.

² The Player's statistics have been taken from the [ATP Tour website](#).

7. In such circumstances, 2025 TADP Article 7.14 provides that:

“7.14.1 At any time prior to a final decision by the Independent Tribunal, the ITIA may invite the Player or other Person to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) asserted and accede to specified Consequences [...]

7.14.2 In the event that the Player or other Person admits the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) asserted and accedes to Consequences specified by the ITIA [...], the ITIA will promptly issue a reasoned decision confirming the commission of the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) and the imposition of the specified Consequences [...], will send notice of the decision to the Player or other Person and to each Interested Party, and will Publicly Disclose the decision in accordance with Article 8.6. [...]

7.14.3 Any decision issued by the ITIA in accordance with Article 7.14.2 that an Anti-Doping Rule Violation has been committed [...] will address and determine (without limitation): (1) the factual basis of the decision that an Anti-Doping Rule Violation was committed; and (2) all of the Consequences to be imposed for such Anti-Doping Rule Violation, including the reasons for imposing the Consequences specified, and in particular the reasons for exercising any discretion not to impose the full Consequences available under this Programme”.

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

8. The ITIA became aware that the Player may have committed an ADRV based on images that the Player had posted of himself on Instagram, a social media platform, in which he appeared to be receiving an intravenous infusion at a medical clinic (**the Clinic**) on 3 December 2024.
9. On 16 January 2025, the ITIA notified the Player that it wished to arrange an interview with him. The interview was arranged to take place in-person in Australia later that day.
10. In advance of the interview on 16 January 2025, the ITIA issued the Player with a Demand to access and download relevant information from his mobile device(s) in accordance with TADP Article 5.7.3.1. The Player immediately complied with this request and cooperated fully with the ITIA.
11. During the interview, which was held shortly after the Demand had been issued to the Player, the Player was asked (*inter alia*) whether he had ever received an intravenous infusion and immediately confirmed that he had, in December 2024, as a recovery treatment to help with fatigue. The Player stated that a friend (also an athlete) had recommended a new health centre that had opened nearby and gave vitamin infusions. The Player further confirmed that: (i) he was unaware both at the time of the infusion and at the time of the ITIA interview what the volume of the treatment was (and had not checked the bag); (ii) he was told by the Clinic that the treatment contained B and C vitamins and magnesium but did not ask to see the bag itself; (iii) he mentioned to his coach, who assisted him with his TADP obligations from time to time, that he was planning on having the infusion and his coach did not warn him that it may be prohibited; and (iv) the Clinic was aware that he was a professional athlete and required to abide by WADA and TADP rules. The Player also confirmed that he had received the infusion for free in exchange for posting an Instagram story about the Clinic.
12. The Player further credibly stated that he had only become aware that intravenous infusions were

prohibited (in some circumstances) after he learned of another player's case which was announced after he had received the treatment and that prior to the treatment he did not do any research on volume limits for intravenous infusions and was unaware that there were any such limits.

13. On 6 February 2025, the Player, who cooperated fully with the investigation, signed a medical release form consenting to the ITIA engaging in direct correspondence with the Clinic in relation to his treatment in December 2024. Subsequently, the Clinic confirmed that the Player had received an intravenous infusion of more than 100ml on 3 December 2024 and the Clinic gave a list of ingredients in the infusion (none of which were Prohibited Substances).
14. On 7 March 2025, the ITIA sent the Player a Notice of a potential ADRV under the TADP.
15. On 19 March 2025, the Player formally accepted a voluntary provisional suspension under the TADP. Prior to that, the Player was not provisionally suspended but had in any event elected not to compete in any tournament or event since the date of the interview, i.e., 16 January 2025.
16. On 21 March 2025, the Player responded to the Notice in which he relevantly:
 - 16.1 stated *"As I understand, my ADRV arises out of me using a Specified Method – the IV Drip – to deal with fatigue, in the off-season (i.e. out-of-competition), having informed the clinic administering the IV Drip that I was a professional athlete, in circumstances where I was completely unaware that my actions could constitute an ADRV."*
 - 16.2 accepted that, on that basis, he had committed an ADRV; but
 - 16.3 alleged *"They (the Clinic) knew I was a professional tennis player. I made it very clear and that I was therefore subject to WADA and TADP rules."*
17. On 3 April 2025, the ITIA sent the Player a formal Charge Letter, asserting that the Player had committed an ADRV in breach of TADP Article 2.2.

III. Consequences

18. The Player has admitted the commission of an ADRV in breach of TADP Article 2.2 and has accepted a ten-month Period of Ineligibility.
19. The reasons for this are set out below.

A. Period of Ineligibility

(i) TADP Article 10.2 – Analysis of Intent

20. This is the Player's first anti-doping rule violation.
21. As explained in the comment to Article 2.2 of the Code, an ADRV of Use may be established by any reliable means, such as admissions by the athlete and documentary evidence. The relevant standard the ITIA must meet is that of comfortable satisfaction, which is defined as *"greater than a mere balance of probability but less than proof beyond a reasonable doubt"* and must be applied *"bearing in mind the seriousness of the allegation which is made"* (Article 3.1 of the TADP).



22. The evidence shows, and the Player admits, that the infusion he received was in excess of 100 mL in a 12 hour period, that he did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption (whether at the time or retrospectively) that covered the infusion, and that the infusion was not received in the course of hospital treatments, surgical procedures, or clinical diagnostic investigations. Thus, the ADRV of the Use of a Prohibited Method is established to the required standard of comfortable satisfaction.
23. Turning then to the applicable Period of Ineligibility and specifically to the question of intent, the Prohibited Method in question is a Specified Method, which, pursuant to the comment to Article 4.2.2 of the Code means that it is not “*considered less important or less dangerous than other doping [methods]*” but is “*more likely to have been consumed or used by an Athlete for a purpose other than the enhancement of sport performance*”.
24. As a result, the Use of this Prohibited Method is rebuttably presumed not to be “intentional” within the meaning of Articles 10.2.1 and 10.2.3 of the TADP, and will result in a two-year sanction unless the ITIA can prove to the same standard of comfortable satisfaction as for the underlying ADRV, that the Player intentionally committed the ADRV (in which case a four year sanction would apply).
25. TADP Article 10.2.3 explains that in this context “*the term ‘intentional’ is meant to identify those Players or other Persons who engage in conduct that they knew constituted an Anti-Doping Rule Violation or knew that there was a significant risk that the conduct might constitute or result in an Anti-Doping Rule Violation and manifestly disregarded that risk*”.
26. When considering this concept, CAS jurisprudence has indicated that “*the term ‘intent’ should be interpreted in a broad sense. Intent is established – of course – if the athlete knowingly ingests a prohibited substance. However, it suffices to qualify the athlete’s behaviour as intentional, if the latter acts with indirect intent only, i.e., if the athlete’s behaviour is primarily focused on one result, but in case a collateral result materializes, the latter would equally be accepted by the athlete. If – figuratively speaking – an athlete runs into a ‘minefield’ ignoring all stop signs along his way, he may well have the primary intention of getting through the ‘minefield’ unharmed. However, an athlete acting in such (reckless) manner somehow accepts that a certain result [...] may materialize and therefore acts with (indirect) intent*” (CAS 2012/A/2822). This award was discussed in CAS 2023/A/9513, where the relevant panel endorsed the above passage and held that “[f]or the concept of indirect intent to apply, two prerequisites need to be fulfilled. First, the Appellant must have known that his conduct involved a significant risk. Second, the Athlete must have manifestly disregarded that risk”.
27. In this case, the ITIA does not consider that an Independent Tribunal would accept that the high standard required to establish intention is satisfied in the circumstances. Whilst the Player did not attempt to check the volume of liquid being administered to him in the intravenous infusion, he asserts, and the ITIA accepts, that this is because he was unaware of any limits. Additionally, the Player openly and publicly posted on social media that he had received the infusion, which is at odds with a professional athlete who knew he was committing an ADRV or that his conduct involved a significant risk that he might be. While not decisive, the ITIA further notes that there are no additional factors that would undermine or otherwise reduce the cogency or plausibility of the Player’s explanation.
28. Accordingly, the ITIA accepts that in all of the circumstances the Player’s commission of the violation was not “intentional” within the meaning of TADP Articles 10.2.1 and 10.2.3, and so the

two-year period of ineligibility set out in TADP Article 10.2.2 is an appropriate starting point.

(ii) TADP Article 10.6 – Analysis of Fault or Negligence

29. TADP Article 10.6 provides that if a player establishes that they bear No Significant Fault or Negligence for the ADRV in question, the Period of Ineligibility may be reduced. *“No Significant Fault or Negligence”* is defined in the TADP as follows: *“The Player [...] establishing that their Fault or Negligence, when viewed in the totality of the circumstances and taking into account the criteria for No Fault or Negligence, was not significant in relation to the Anti-Doping Rule Violation”*.
30. The facts and evidence in these proceedings demonstrate a degree of fault and negligence on the part of the Player. The Player is a high-level tennis player who has received anti-doping education over several years during his career and, through this education, should have been aware of the risks associated with medical and health treatments and the need to take steps to ensure that, by receiving the intravenous infusion, he was not engaging in prohibited conduct. He could be expected: (i) to be aware of the relevant regulations concerning intravenous infusions (and indeed all Prohibited Methods) and (ii) to double check any substance that was being administered to him, especially in a quasi-medical context. With that said, the ITIA notes that the Player’s intravenous infusion was a one off, and it accepts that the Player was unaware that he was committing an ADRV, that he had not received specific education on intravenous infusions,¹ that he had informed his coach – who often assisted him with his anti-doping obligations – that he was booked in to receive an intravenous infusion and was not warned that this treatment could result in an ADRV, and that he informed the Clinic that he was a professional athlete.
31. In determining the appropriate period of ineligibility, the ITIA is also mindful of the sanctions imposed in comparable cases including in particular those of *USADA v Lochte*² and *Ironman v Dels*³, where in each case the athletes also openly and publicly posted on their own social media platforms that they had received intravenous infusions.⁴
32. Taking the foregoing and the specific facts of this case into account, the ITIA has proposed, and the Player has acceded to, a period of ineligibility of ten months.

B. Commencement of Period of Ineligibility and Credit for Provisional Suspension

33. Pursuant to Articles 10.13 and 10.13.2 of the TADP, the Period of Ineligibility will start on the date that this agreed sanction is accepted by the Player, with credit for the provisional suspension already served.
34. The Player accepted a voluntary provisional suspension on 19 March 2025 and is entitled to credit for the period of provisional suspension served from then until the date of this agreed sanction.

¹ For the sake of clarity, the ITIA notes that following the Player’s case (and other recent high profile cases involving infusions), as well as warnings that have been issued in relation to intravenous infusions and further and more specific education, it may be increasingly difficult for players (and other athletes) to receive a reduction to their Period of Ineligibility for cases involving this particular Prohibited Method.

² [Ryan Lochte Accepts Doping Sanction | USADA](#) [No full decision on open source]

³ [Dels ADRV Release final.pdf](#) [No full decision on open source]

⁴ See also two more recent cases in which the relevant athletes brought the intravenous infusion (and thus commission of an ADRV) to the ADO’s attention themselves and received four month sanctions under a Case Resolution Agreement [Microsoft Word - Press Release - AIU HEAD CAUTIONS ATHLETES ABOUT USING POPULAR ‘IV THERAPIES’ .docx](#)

35. Accordingly, the Player will serve the remainder of the period of Ineligibility from the date of this decision, and his ineligibility will expire at midnight on 18 January 2026.

C. Disqualification of results

36. Finally, TADP Article 10.10 states that “[u]nless fairness requires otherwise” then the “results obtained by the Player in Competitions taking place in the period starting on the date the [...] 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”.
37. Article 10.1 of the Code applies to the disqualification of results in an Event, and the ITIA accepts that it may apply by analogy in the present case. This Article provides that “[f]actors to be included in considering whether to Disqualify other results in an Event might include, for example, the seriousness of the Athlete’s anti-doping rule violation and whether the Athlete tested negative in the other Competitions”.
38. The Player’s ADRV was committed in December 2024, however he was not charged until it had become known to the ITIA and confirmed in April 2025. In the meantime, the Player participated in a number of events and provided one in-competition doping control sample which tested negative. The ITIA therefore accepts that “fairness requires” the disqualification of the Player’s results from the date of his ADRV on 3 December 2024 until his first subsequent negative doping control sample, which was provided on 16 January 2025.
39. In accordance with TADP Article 10.10, the Player’s results during his disqualification period shall include the forfeiture of any medals, titles, ranking points, and prize money received during the following events:
- 39.1 Canberra International, ATP Challenger, (Canberra, Australia between 30 December 2024 – 4 January 2025) - doubles draw;
- 39.2 Adelaide International, ATP 250, (Adelaide, Australia between 6 - 11 January 2025) - doubles draw; and
- 39.3 Australian Open, (Melbourne, Australia between 12 - 26 January 2025) – doubles draw.

C. Costs

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

D. Publication

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

E. Acceptance by the Player

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



IV. Rights of appeal

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

Issued Decision of the ITIA

London, 11 August 2025

