

Issued Decision

UK Anti-Doping and Michael Pomfret

Disciplinary Proceedings under the Anti-Doping Rules of England Lacrosse

This is an Issued Decision made by UK Anti-Doping Limited ('UKAD') pursuant to the Anti-Doping Rules ('ADR') of England Lacrosse ('EL'). It concerns Anti-Doping Rule Violations ('ADRVs') committed by Mr Michael Pomfret 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. EL is the national governing body for the sport of lacrosse in England. UKAD is the National Anti-Doping Organisation in the United Kingdom. EL has adopted, as its own ADR, the UK Anti-Doping Rules¹, which are issued by UKAD and subject to updates made by UKAD, as necessary and in accordance with the World Anti-Doping Code.
2. Mr Pomfret is a 26-year-old lacrosse player. As a member of EL, at all relevant times Mr Pomfret was subject to the jurisdiction of EL 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 EL.
3. On 28 February 2025, a UKAD Doping Control Officer ('DCO') collected a urine Sample from Mr Pomfret, Out-of-Competition, at his home address in Manchester, England.
4. Assisted by the DCO, Mr Pomfret split the urine Sample into two separate bottles which were given reference numbers A8212335 (the 'A Sample') and B8212335 (the 'B Sample').
5. Both Samples were transported to the World Anti-Doping Agency ('WADA') accredited laboratory, the Drug Control Centre, King's College London (the 'Laboratory'). The Laboratory analysed the A Sample in accordance with the procedures set out in WADA's International Standard for Laboratories.

¹ Version 1.0, in effect as from 1 January 2021

6. Analysis of the A Sample returned Adverse Analytical Findings ('AAFs') for RAD140 and ostarine.
7. RAD140 and ostarine (together, 'the Prohibited Substances') are selective androgen receptor modulators ('SARMs') and are both listed under section S1.2 of the 2025 WADA Prohibited List. They are non-Specified Substances that are prohibited at all times.
8. On 9 May 2025, UKAD sent Mr Pomfret a letter (the 'Notice Letter'), confirming the imposition of a Provisional Suspension and formally notifying him, in accordance with ADR Article 7.8, that he may have committed ADRVs pursuant to ADR Article 2.1 (Presence of a Prohibited Substance in an Athlete's Sample) and/or ADR Article 2.2 (Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance). The Notice Letter invited Mr Pomfret to provide an explanation for the alleged ADRVs.
9. On 2 June 2025, Mr Pomfret responded to the Notice Letter by admitting the presence and Use violations, but added that the ADRVs were committed "*unintentionally and/or with No Significant Fault or Negligence*".
10. Mr Pomfret stated that he believed the AAFs were caused by his ingestion of a supplement called "*Muscle Fuel Anabolic All-In-One Shake Strawberry*" ('Muscle Fuel'), which he had purchased "*from a local supplement store*" (the 'store'). Mr Pomfret suggested that his AAFs were attributable to his ingestion of Muscle Fuel which, he suspected, was contaminated with the Prohibited Substances. Mr Pomfret stated that, while he was also taking various other supplements,² he did not believe that those supplements caused the AAFs because they contained "*natural ingredients*".
11. The Muscle Fuel and other supplements listed in Mr Pomfret's response were not declared by Mr Pomfret on the Doping Control Form he completed at the time of Sample collection. In his response to the Notice Letter, Mr Pomfret stated that he believed he was only required to provide the details of medication that he was taking at that time.
12. Mr Pomfret further stated that he had first purchased Muscle Fuel from a high street retailer in 2017. He stated that, at the time of his first purchase, he checked some (but not all) of the ingredients against the then applicable Prohibited List. Mr Pomfret accepted that he did not check whether Muscle Fuel had been batch tested and/or otherwise certified.
13. Mr Pomfret stated that when purchasing the tub of Muscle Fuel (he was using at the time of Sample collection) from the store, he had relied on his 2017 review of the ingredients listed on the high street retailer's website, as well as his previous experience of buying the product from the high street retailer. Mr Pomfret accepted

² Namely, "*L-Glutamine*", "*Vitamin D3 4000iu + K2*", "*Shilajit 200mg*", "*Seamoss 300mg and Lions Mane 300mg capsules*", and "*Turmeric with Black Pepper 600mg capsules*".

that the store “does not have a website and there is no similar listing available from [the store] for...Muscle Fuel”.

14. Mr Pomfret stated that he had researched Muscle Fuel in greater detail following receipt of the Notice Letter and now understood that the product “*is not batch tested and is not certified by Informed Sport*”.
15. Mr Pomfret indicated that the specific tub of Muscle Fuel that he was using at the time of Sample collection had finished and was disposed of, and therefore was unavailable for analysis. Mr Pomfret stated he had another tub of Muscle Fuel available for analysis, if required. Mr Pomfret further added, “*I do not have the financial resources to obtain my own expert evidence to conduct any analysis and/or testing*”.
16. On 31 July 2025, UKAD proceeded to issue Mr Pomfret with a Charge Letter in accordance with ADR Article 7.11.2. The Charge Letter asserted the commission of ADRVs pursuant to ADR Article 2.1 (Presence of a Prohibited Substance in an Athlete’s Sample) and ADR Article 2.2 (Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance) in respect of RAD140 and ostarine.

Admissions and Consequences

17. On 19 August 2025, Mr Pomfret provided his response to the Charge Letter. Mr Pomfret admitted to the ADRVs charged and accepted the asserted period of Ineligibility of six (6) years (comprising of a four (4) year period of Ineligibility in accordance with ADR Article 10.2.1(a) plus an additional two (2) year period of Ineligibility on account of Aggravating Circumstances).

18. 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.

19. ADR Article 2.2 provides that the following is also 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.

20. 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.

10.2.3 As used in Article 10.2, the term “intentional” is meant to identify those Athletes or other Persons who engage in conduct which they know constitutes an Anti-Doping Rule Violation or they know that there is a significant risk that the conduct might constitute or result in an Anti-Doping Rule Violation and they manifestly disregard that risk...

21. In accordance with ADR Article 10.2.1(a), since this matter concerns non-Specified Prohibited Substances, the starting point for the applicable period of Ineligibility shall be four (4) years, unless Mr Pomfret can establish, on the balance of probabilities that the ADRVs were not ‘intentional’ (within the meaning of ADR Article 10.2.3).
22. While Mr Pomfret asserted (in response to the Notice Letter) that the ADRVs were not intentional within the meaning of ADR Article 10.2.3 and that he suspected they were caused by his ingestion of a supplement he considered may be contaminated, he did not seek to establish the same in his response to the Charge Letter. Instead, Mr Pomfret admitted the ADRVs and accepted the asserted period of Ineligibility. Accordingly, Mr Pomfret 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 a starting point.
23. For the purposes of imposing a sanction, the ADRVs will be considered together as a single first violation, 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 (or the second and third 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 more severe sanction, including the application of Aggravating Circumstances...

Aggravating Circumstances

24. The analysis of Mr Pomfret's urine Sample revealed the presence of two (2) Prohibited Substances.

25. ADR Article 10.4 provides as follows:

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.

26. '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.*

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

28. Pursuant to the definition in the ADR, circumstances which may amount to Aggravating Circumstances may include [emphasis added]:

... 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.

29. UKAD has considered the seriousness of Mr Pomfret's ADRVs and the nature of the Aggravating Circumstances. UKAD notes (amongst other factors) Mr Pomfret's Use of multiple Prohibited Substances (both of which were SARMS, substances that have similar performance enhancing properties to anabolic steroids), his age at the time of the ADRVs, his work as a sports therapist, his education (he was awarded a degree in Sport and Exercise Science), his specific anti-doping education, and his

participation in lacrosse at the highest level. UKAD considers that pursuant to ADR Article 10.4, Aggravating Circumstances have been established which justify the imposition of a period of Ineligibility greater than four (4) years. UKAD has determined that an additional two (2) year period of Ineligibility should be applied as a result of the seriousness of the violation and the nature of the Aggravating Circumstances in this matter.

30. Therefore, the period of Ineligibility in this case after applying ADR Article 10.4 is six (6) years.

Application of ADR Article 10.8.1

31. ADR Article 10.8.1 provides:

10.8.1 One (1) year reduction for certain Anti-Doping Rule Violations based on early admission and acceptance of sanction:

Where UKAD sends an Athlete or other Person a Charge Letter for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation that carries an asserted period of Ineligibility of four (4) or more years (including any period of Ineligibility asserted under Article 10.4), if the Athlete or other Person admits the violation and accepts the asserted period of Ineligibility no later than twenty (20) days after receiving the Charge Letter, they shall receive a one (1) year reduction in the period of Ineligibility asserted by UKAD. Where the Athlete or other Person receives the one (1) year reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility under this Article 10.8.1, no further reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility shall be allowed under any other Article.

32. Mr Pomfret admitted both ADRVs and accepted the asserted period of Ineligibility of six (6) years within twenty (20) days of receiving the Charge Letter. Therefore, ADR Article 10.8.1 applies and Mr Pomfret shall receive a one (1) year reduction to the period of Ineligibility of six (6) years. The period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore five (5) years.

Commencement of period of Ineligibility

33. ADR Article 10.13 requires that the period of Ineligibility starts on the date Ineligibility is accepted or otherwise imposed where there is no hearing.

34. However, ADR Article 10.13.2 allows for credit to be given against the total period of Ineligibility to be served where an Athlete has been provisionally suspended and has respected the terms of that Provisional Suspension.

35. Mr Pomfret has been subject to a Provisional Suspension since the date he received the Notice Letter (i.e. 9 May 2025) and, so far as UKAD is aware, he has respected the terms of that Provisional Suspension. Therefore, affording Mr Pomfret credit for

the time he has spent provisionally suspended, his period of Ineligibility is deemed to have commenced on 9 May 2025 and will end at 11:59pm on 8 May 2030.

Status during Ineligibility

36. During the period of Ineligibility, in accordance with ADR Article 10.14.1, Mr Pomfret 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 and/or recognised by:
- a) EL;
 - 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 including, but not limited to, British Lacrosse ('BL');
 - 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.
37. Mr Pomfret may return to train with a team or to use the facilities of an EL (or BL) club or a Signatory's member organisation during the last two (2) months of his period of Ineligibility (i.e. from 11:59pm on 8 March 2030) pursuant to ADR Article 10.14.4(b).

Summary

38. For the reasons given above, UKAD has issued this Decision in accordance with ADR Article 7.12.2, and records that:
- a) Mr Pomfret 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 a single first violation for the purposes of imposing a sanction;
 - c) In accordance with ADR Article 10.8.1, Mr Pomfret is entitled to a one (1) year reduction to the asserted period of Ineligibility of six (6) years. A five (5) year period of Ineligibility is therefore imposed;
 - d) Acknowledging Mr Pomfret's Provisional Suspension, the period of Ineligibility is deemed to have commenced on 9 May 2025 and will expire at 11:59pm on 8 May 2030;
 - e) Mr Pomfret's status during the period of Ineligibility shall be as detailed in ADR Article 10.14.

39. Mr Pomfret, EL, World Lacrosse and WADA have a right to appeal against this Decision or any part of it in accordance with ADR Article 13.4.
40. This Decision will be publicly announced via UKAD's website in accordance with ADR Article 8.5.3 and ADR Article 10.15.

22 January 2026