

Issued Decision

UK Anti-Doping and Matthew Hutt

Disciplinary Proceedings under the Anti-Doping Rules of British Cycling

This is an Issued Decision made by UK Anti-Doping Limited ('UKAD') pursuant to the Anti-Doping Rules ('ADR') of British Cycling ('BC'). It concerns Anti-Doping Rule Violations ('ADRVs') committed by Mr Matthew Hutt and records the applicable Consequences.

Capitalised terms used in this Decision shall have the meaning given to them in the ADR unless otherwise indicated.

Background and Facts

1. BC is the national governing body for the sport of cycling in the United Kingdom. UKAD is the National Anti-Doping Organisation for the United Kingdom. BC has adopted, as its own ADR, the UK Anti-Doping Rules¹, which are issued by and subject to updates made by UKAD, as necessary and in accordance with the World Anti-Doping Code.
2. Mr Hutt is a 22-year-old BMX rider. As an Athlete registered with BC, at all relevant times, Mr Hutt was subject to the jurisdiction of BC and bound to comply with the ADR. Pursuant to ADR Article 7.2, UKAD has Results Management responsibility in respect of all Athletes that are subject to the jurisdiction of BC.
3. On 7 July 2024, UKAD Doping Control Personnel ('DCP') collected a urine Sample (the 'First Sample') from Mr Hutt, In-Competition, at the BMX National Series held in Birmingham.
4. Assisted by a UKAD Doping Control Officer ('DCO') in attendance, Mr Hutt split the First Sample into two separate bottles which were given reference numbers A1193962 (the 'First A Sample') and B1193962 (the 'First B Sample'). The First Samples were transported to the World Anti-Doping Agency ('WADA') accredited laboratory, the Drug Control Centre, King's College London (the 'Laboratory').

¹ Version 1.0, in effect as from 1 January 2021

5. On 25 July 2024, prior to the Laboratory completing its analysis of the First A Sample, UKAD DCP collected a further urine Sample from Mr Hutt (the 'Second Sample'), Out-of-Competition, at his home address.
6. Assisted by the UKAD DCO in attendance, Mr Hutt split the Second Sample into two separate bottles which were given the reference numbers A1188321 (the 'Second A Sample') and B1188321 (the 'Second B Sample'). The Second Samples were transported to the Laboratory.

Analysis of the First A Sample

7. The First A Sample was analysed in accordance with the procedures set out in WADA's International Standard for Laboratories ('ISL') and detected a testosterone/epitestosterone ratio ('T/E ratio') of 50.42. As a result, the First A Sample underwent further analysis by way of Gas Chromatography/ Combustion/ Isotope-Ratio Mass Spectrometry ('GC/C/IRMS') to determine the origin of the testosterone detected.
8. GC/C/IRMS analysis of the First A Sample was conducted by the Laboratory in accordance with the procedures set out in WADA's Technical Document for the Detection of Synthetic Forms of Prohibited Substances by GC/C/IMS ('TD2022IRMS').
9. The results of the GC/C/IRMS confirmed an Adverse Analytical Finding ('AAF') for testosterone and testosterone Metabolites (etiocholanolone; 5 β -androstane-3 α ,17 β -diol; and androsterone) of non-endogenous origin, compatible with the exogenous administration of testosterone (the 'First AAF').
10. Testosterone is listed under Section 1.1 of the 2024 WADA Prohibited List as an Anabolic Androgenic Steroid. It is a non-Specified Substance that is prohibited at all times when administered exogenously.
11. On 30 August 2024, UKAD sent Mr Hutt a Notice Letter (the 'First Notice Letter') in relation to the First AAF. The First Notice Letter confirmed the imposition of a Provisional Suspension and formally notified Mr Hutt, in accordance with ADR Article 7.8, that he may have committed ADRVs pursuant to ADR Article 2.1 (Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample) and/or ADR Article 2.2 (Use or Attempted Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method). The First Notice Letter informed Mr Hutt that analysis of the Second A Sample was pending and that he would be informed of any AAF(s) resulting from that analysis in due course.

Analysis of the Second A Sample

12. The Second A Sample was analysed in accordance with the procedures set out in the ISL and WADA's Technical Document for the Harmonization of Analysis and Reporting of 19-Norsteroids Related to Nandrolone ('TD2021NA').

13. Analysis of the Second A Sample returned AAFs for the following Prohibited Substances and/or Metabolites:
- a) metandienone Metabolites:
6 β -Hydroxy-metandienone;
17 α -Methyl-5 β -androstane-3 α ,17 β -diol;
17 β -Hydroxymethyl,17 α -methyl-18-nor-androst-1,4,13-trien-3-one;
17 β -Methyl-5 β -androst-1-ene-3 α ,17 α -diol (Epimetendiol); and
17-epimetandienone
 - b) nandrolone (19-nortestosterone)
 - c) nandrolone Metabolites:
19-Norandrosterone; and
19-Noretiocholanolone
 - d) drostanolone
 - e) drostanolone Metabolites:
3 α -Hydroxy-2 α -methyl-5 α -androstan-17-on

(together, the 'Second AAFs').
14. Metandienone, nandrolone, and drostanolone are all listed under Section 1.1 of the 2024 WADA Prohibited List as Anabolic Androgenic Steroids. They are non-Specified Substances that are prohibited at all times.
15. On 20 September 2024, UKAD sent Mr Hutt a further Notice Letter (the 'Second Notice Letter') in relation to the Second AAFs. The Second Notice Letter formally notified Mr Hutt, in accordance with ADR Article 7.8, that he may have committed ADRVs pursuant to ADR Article 2.1 (Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample) and/or ADR Article 2.2 (Use or Attempted Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method).
16. The First and Second Notice Letters invited Mr Hutt to provide an explanation for the alleged ADRVs. The deadline for a response to each Notice Letter was 25 September 2024.
17. On 27 September 2024, having received no response to the First or Second Notice Letters, UKAD emailed Mr Hutt, asking him to confirm if he needed additional time to respond.

18. On 10 October 2024, having still received no response to the First or Second Notice Letters, UKAD emailed Mr Hutt again, requesting that he provide his response by no later than 17 October 2024.
19. On 21 October 2024, Mr Hutt emailed UKAD, asking for a short extension until 25 October 2024 to respond, citing difficulties with seeking legal advice.
20. On 29 October 2024, UKAD emailed Mr Hutt to say it had still not received his response to the First or Second Notice Letters and asked him to provide his response by no later than 1 November 2024.
21. On 19 November 2024, UKAD emailed Mr Hutt again to say it had still not received his response to the First or Second Notice Letters, and that if no response was received by 22 November 2024, it would proceed to issue him with a Charge Letter.
22. On 20 December 2024, having still received no response to the First and Second Notice Letters, UKAD emailed Mr Hutt again, requesting that he share anything he would like to be considered by no later than 6 January 2025.
23. On 10 January 2025, UKAD proceeded to issue Mr Hutt with a Charge Letter in accordance with ADR Article 7.11.2 (after expiry of the deadline specified in the First and Second Notice Letters for receipt of a response from Mr Hutt). The Charge Letter asserted the commission of ADRVs pursuant to Article 2.1 (Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample) and/or Article 2.2 (Use of a Prohibited Substance) and UKAD's conclusion that Aggravating Circumstances are present which justify the imposition of a six (6) year period of Ineligibility in respect of Mr Hutt's ADRVs. Mr Hutt was asked to provide his response to the Charge Letter by no later than 30 January 2025.
24. On 10 January 2025, UKAD attempted to contact Mr Hutt via telephone and text message. No response was received. However, a notification was received by UKAD indicating that Mr Hutt had accessed the enclosures to the Charge Letter.
25. On 12 February 2025, having still received no response to the Charge Letter, UKAD emailed Mr Hutt again, inviting him to share anything that he would like to be taken into account by UKAD when producing this Decision, by no later than 19 February 2025.

Deemed admission and Consequences

26. UKAD received no response from Mr Hutt in respect of the Charge Letter. In accordance with ADR Article 7.11.4, Mr Hutt is therefore deemed to have admitted the ADRVs charged and to have acceded to the Consequences specified in the Charge Letter. As such, this case can be resolved by way of this Decision and without the need for a hearing.
27. ADR Article 2.1 provides that the following is an ADRV:

2.1 Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample, unless the Athlete establishes that the presence is consistent with a TUE granted in accordance with Article 4.

28. ADR Article 2.2 provides that the following is an ADRV:

2.2 Use or Attempted Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method, unless the Athlete establishes that the Use or Attempted Use is consistent with a TUE granted in accordance with Article 4.

29. ADR Article 10.2 provides as follows:

10.2 Imposition of a Period of Ineligibility for the Presence, Use or Attempted Use, or Possession of a Prohibited Substance and/or a Prohibited Method.

The period of Ineligibility for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Article 2.1, 2.2 or 2.6 that is the Athlete's or other Person's first anti-doping offence shall be as follows, subject to potential elimination, reduction or suspension pursuant to Article 10.5, 10.6 or 10.7:

10.2.1 Save where Article 10.2.4(a) applies, the period of Ineligibility shall be four (4) years where:

(a) The Anti-Doping Rule Violation does not involve a Specified Substance or a Specified Method, unless the Athlete or other Person can establish that the Anti-Doping Rule Violation was not intentional.

(b) [...]

10.2.2 If Article 10.2.1 does not apply, then (subject to Article 10.2.4(a)) the period of Ineligibility shall be two (2) years.

30. In accordance with ADR Article 10.2.1(a), since this matter concerns non-Specified Substances, the applicable period of Ineligibility shall be four (4) years, unless Mr Hutt can establish, on the balance of probabilities, that the ADRVs were not 'intentional' (within the meaning of ADR Article 10.2.3).

31. As a result of his lack of response to UKAD, Mr Hutt is deemed to have admitted the ADRVs charged. Mr Hutt has not sought to establish that his ADRVs were not 'intentional' (within the meaning of ADR Article 10.2.3). Accordingly, Mr Hutt is not entitled to a two (2) year period of Ineligibility pursuant to ADR Article 10.2.2, or any reduction pursuant to ADR Article 10.5 (No Fault or Negligence) or ADR Article 10.6 (No Significant Fault or Negligence) thereafter. Consequently, the period of Ineligibility under ADR Article 10.2.1(a) of four (4) years applies as the standard sanction.

32. For the purposes of imposing a sanction, the ADRVs will be considered together as a single first violation (the Second AAFs having occurred prior to the provision of the

First Notice Letter in relation to the First AAF), pursuant to ADR Article 10.9.4 which states as follows:

10.9.4 Additional rules for certain potential multiple offences:

- (a) *For the purposes of imposing sanctions under Article 10.9, except as provided in Articles 10.9.4(b) and 10.9.4(c) an Anti-Doping Rule Violation will only be considered a second (or third, as applicable) Anti-Doping Rule Violation if UKAD can establish that the Athlete or other Person committed the additional Anti-Doping Rule Violation after they received notice, or after UKAD or its designee made a reasonable attempt to give notice, of the first (or the second, as applicable) Anti-Doping Rule Violation. Otherwise, the first and second Anti-Doping Rule Violations as applicable shall be considered as one single first Anti-Doping Rule Violation, and the sanction imposed shall be based on the Anti-Doping Rule Violation that carries the most severe sanction, including the application of Aggravating Circumstances...*

Aggravating Circumstances

33. ADR Article 10.4 provides:

10.4 Aggravating Circumstances which may increase the period of Ineligibility

If UKAD establishes, in an individual case involving an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Article 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 or 2.10, that Aggravating Circumstances are present that justify the imposition of a period of Ineligibility greater than the standard sanction otherwise applicable in accordance with Article 10.2 or 10.3 the period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable shall be increased by an additional period of Ineligibility of up to two (2) years depending on the seriousness of the violation and the nature of the Aggravating Circumstances, unless the Athlete or other Person can establish that they did not knowingly commit the Anti-Doping Rule Violation.

34. 'Aggravating Circumstances' are defined in the ADR as follows:

Aggravating Circumstances: *Circumstances involving, or actions by an Athlete or other Person which may justify the imposition of a period of Ineligibility greater than the standard sanction.*

35. The examples of circumstances and conduct in relation to Aggravating Circumstances that are provided in the ADR are not exhaustive.

36. Pursuant to the definition in the ADR, circumstances which may amount to Aggravating Circumstances may include:

...the Athlete or other Person Used or Possessed multiple Prohibited Substances or Prohibited Methods, Used or Possessed a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method on multiple occasions, or committed multiple other Anti-Doping Rule Violations.

37. UKAD has considered the circumstances of Mr Hutt's ADRVs, which includes the presence of four (4) different Prohibited Substances and/or Metabolites across multiple A Samples, and considers that Aggravating Circumstances have been established which justify the imposition of a period of Ineligibility greater than the standard sanction, pursuant to ADR Article 10.4. Mr Hutt has not sought to establish that he did not knowingly commit the ADRVs charged. UKAD has determined that, in view of the Aggravating Circumstances established in the case, the standard sanction should be increased by two (2) years.
38. Therefore, the applicable period of Ineligibility in this case is six (6) years.

Commencement of period of Ineligibility

39. ADR Article 10.13.2(a) states that if an Athlete does not respect a Provisional Suspension in full (which includes a prohibition against participation, as detailed at ADR Article 10.14.1), they shall receive no credit for any period of Provisional Suspension served.
40. On 4 August 2025, UKAD received information that whilst subject to a Provisional Suspension, Mr Hutt delivered coaching sessions at Runnymede Rockets BMX Club in breach of ADR Article 10.14.1. On the same date, UKAD wrote to Mr Hutt, informing him that it had been made aware that he had failed to respect his Provisional Suspension in full and invited him to make any representations in response by 11 August 2025. UKAD received no response from Mr Hutt.
41. Mr Hutt has been subject to a Provisional Suspension since the date he received the First Notice Letter, i.e., since 30 August 2024. On the basis that Mr Hutt has failed to respect the terms of his Provisional Suspension in full, Mr Hutt is afforded no credit for the time spent provisionally suspended. Therefore in accordance with ADR Article 10.13, Mr Hutt's period of Ineligibility commences on the date of this Decision, 15 August 2025, and will end at 11:59pm on 14 August 2031.

Status during Ineligibility

42. During the period of Ineligibility, in accordance with ADR Article 10.14.1, Mr Hutt shall not be permitted to participate in any capacity (or assist any Athlete participating in any capacity) in a Competition, Event, or other activity (other than authorised anti-doping education or rehabilitation programmes) organised, convened, authorised, or recognised by:
- a) BC;
 - b) any Signatory;
 - c) any club or other body that is a member of, or affiliated to, or licensed by, a Signatory or a Signatory's member organisation;

- d) any professional league or any international or national-level Event organisation; or
 - e) any elite or national-level sporting activity funded by a governmental agency.
43. Mr Hutt may return to train with a team or to use the facilities of a BC-affiliated club or a Signatory's member organisation during the last two (2) months of his period of Ineligibility (i.e. from 11.59pm on 14 June 2031) pursuant to ADR Article 10.14.4(b).

Disqualification

44. ADR Article 9.1 provides as follows:

9.1 *Disqualification of Competition results as a consequence of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation committed in connection with or arising out of an In-Competition test*

An Anti-Doping Rule Violation in Individual Sports in connection with or arising out of an In-Competition test automatically leads to Disqualification of the results obtained in the Competition in question, with all resulting consequences, including forfeiture of any medals, titles, points and prizes.

45. Pursuant to the above, the result obtained by Mr Hutt in the BMX National Series Birmingham 2024 is automatically disqualified.

Summary

46. For the reasons given above, UKAD has issued this Decision in accordance with ADR Article 7.12.2, and records that:
- a) Mr Hutt has committed ADRVs pursuant to ADR Articles 2.1 and 2.2;
 - b) In accordance with ADR Article 10.9.4(a) the ADRVs are considered as one (1) single ADRV for the purposes of imposing a sanction;
 - c) The applicable period of Ineligibility is six (6) years under the application of ADR Articles 10.2.1(a) and 10.4;
 - d) Affording no credit for time Mr Hutt spent provisionally suspended, the period of Ineligibility commences on the date of this Decision, 15 August 2025, and will expire at 11:59pm on 14 August 2031;
 - e) The result obtained by Mr Hutt in the BMX National Series Birmingham 2024 is automatically disqualified in accordance with ADR Article 9.1; and
 - f) Mr Hutt's status during the period of Ineligibility shall be as detailed in ADR Article 10.14.
47. Mr Hutt, BC, Union Cycliste Internationale ('UCI'), and WADA have a right to appeal against this Decision or any part of it in accordance with ADR Article 13.4.

48. This Decision will be publicly announced via UKAD's website in accordance with ADR Article 8.5.3 and ADR Article 10.15.

15 August 2025