International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)
ISSN: 2319-7064
Impact Factor 2025: 7.089

Sports Dispute Resolution in Olympics

Adv. Anuja Vijaya Pravin Maheshwari[1], Dr. Shivani Jain[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University Udaipur

[2]Research Guide, Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University Udaipur

Abstract: ***The Olympic Games being the largest sporting event in the world cannot help to lead to a diversity of contradictions that include doping scandals, issues relating to eligibility and international disputes at the national level, cases of discipline, and business conflicts. Lack of rapid, objective, and expert resolution of disputes has even compelled the establishment of the Court of Arbitration for the sport (CAS) that hosts an Ad Hoc Division that is mobile in the Olympics, where disputes are resolved within 24 and 48 hours of time. This paper discusses the organization and operations of CAS, the nature of the cases it resolves, and how either the integrity of the Games is being jeopardized in an unprecedented fashion. Even though CAS has achieved effectiveness in terms of speed and enforceability, there are still issues of attention related to its autonomy, accessibility and the under-representation of athletes. The study will use the methodological approach of being doctrinal and analytical, referring to case laws, legislations and international tools to assess the effectiveness of CAS. The results indicate that in spite of the effectiveness of CAS in settling Olympic controversies, the platform needs to be reformed to contribute to the enhancement of the fairness, the participation of athletes as well as the credibility of the dispute resolution system in the long term.***

Keywords: Sports Dispute Resolution, Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), Olympic Games, CAS Ad Hoc Division, Sports Arbitration, Athlete Rights, Sports Governance, Procedural Fairness.

List of Abbreviations

SDR	Sports Dispute Resolution
CAS	Court of Arbitration for Sport
OG	Olympics Games
IOC	International Olympics Committee
WADA	World Anti-Doping Agency
ICC	International Cricket Council

1. Introduction

The Olympic Games are a great example of the highest standard of sporting contests as well as the economy of international collaboration, intercultural exchange and human potential glorification. Since their reintroduction in 1896, the Games have increased respectively in magnitude, bringing thousands of competitors, referees, sponsors and audiences around the world. Also, with this expansion has come a growing complexity in regulation, governance and legal control and supervision. The varying background of the athletes, as well as differences in numbers and purposes of international sporting federations, domestic statutes and the commercial interests make Olympic Games especially prone to conflicting situations of the different nature.

There is nothing unique about sports disputes that are associated with the Olympics. There are problems of eligibility of players, doping, breaches of contract and sanctions in major leagues and associations like international competitions. The Olympic situation is however a different story. The Games are held within a period of limited time that is fixed within small intervals, and issues may have to be accompanied by a resolution in a mere span of hours or even days. The conventional litigation with the national courts is usually not the best to address these emergent demands, with the slowness of the judicial systems, problems that arise in jurisdiction, and insufficient expertise in sports law. The failure of traditional legal channels in the Olympic environment has attributed the need and urgency to have specific mechanisms of fast and just dispute resolution.

Development in this direction has occurred mostly when the International Olympics Committee (IOC) in 1984 introduced the Court of Arbitration of Sport (CAS). CAS, which is based in Lausanne, Switzerland, was established as an arbitral body with an independent status, the body adjudicates on sport-related disputes. Understanding the Olympics demands, the Ad Hoc Division was unveiled by CAS in the year 1996 when the Games were held at Atlanta. It is the division that works only in the Olympics so that athletes and other stakeholders have a platform where they can dissolve such issues within minutes and most often a verdict will be made in the range of 24 to 48 hours. This is a very important speed given that any kind of dispute might deprive a sportsperson of a once-in-a-life competitive race.

Dispute resolution procedures are important in the Olympic movement, not just because the procedures are convenient. The entities involved include the rights of athletes, integrity of the competition, and the integrity of the Olympic spirit. As an example, due to the controversy of doping, it not only defines how a particular athlete would travel on his or her career, but also affects the overall image of fairness in sport. The questions of inclusion, identity, and equality related to eligibility and nationality, where disciplinary issues and protests tend to overlap with the political expression and human rights. All these conflicts can cause a bad perception to the Olympics in case they are not addressed in an open and fair manner.

Although CAS plays a very crucial role, its functioning has become an issue of concern. The critics mention the issue of independence and impartiality, as it is historically close to the IOC. Transparency has also been doubted, since most proceedings are confidential, so it cannot be reviewed. There is also the athlete representation problem where certain scholars curse that in most cases, athletes have little influence in developing the dispute resolution process relative to strong bodies like international federations and the IOC. These

issues set the contrast of the desire to hurry and the necessity to provide fairness in solving Olympic issues.

The conducted research engages in an extensive survey of sports dispute resolution in Olympics, especially focusing on how CAS and its Ad Hoc Section work. The examination of the major controversies, case studies, as well as applicable legal tools of Olympic Charter and World Anti-Doping Code enables the examination of the hypothesis whether the existing mechanisms have succeeded in the protection of the rights of athletes without prejudice to the integrity of the Games. The study takes a methodology which can be assumed to be doctrinal and analytic as it uses the case law, statutes, international conventions and commentaries of the scholars. It is hoped that the results will reveal that, CAS offers an efficient and required framework to overcome conflict at Olympics, there are major reformations to be done to make it legit. It is the need to have reforms like transparency and increased involvement of the athletes and introducing mechanisms that are independent to undertake the responsibility of dispute resolution in the Olympic arena is not only speedy but is also fair and above board. Conclusively, there is more than a certain sporting contest in Olympic Games, but rather, these games are a demonstration of how man strives to excel in all of humankind and seek fairness. It is important to make sure that the conflicts are compromised without favor, with transparency, and effectiveness to preserve the reputation of players, referees, and the whole world. In the absence of this trust, the principle of Olympic spirit of oneness, friendship and respect are at stake.

2. Statement of the Problem

Due to its nature of world scale and reputation, the Olympic Games are surrounded by a myriad of controversies directly impacting on athletes, sporting federations as well as on the credibility of the Games. Most of these conflicts are an aspect of doping, eligibility, and nationality, punishment, businesses, and violation to the Olympic Charter. Contrary to other situations, disagreements in the Olympics require instant resolution, where a slight delay does lead to disqualification of an athlete of person to take part in a given event. The conventional judiciary to evaluate such cases with time delays, geographical complexities, and failure to have expertise in sports law, cannot depend on these systems.

To deal with those challenges CAS and the Ad Hoc Division were created to address all disputes through fast, specialized and neutral judgment. Although CAS has been effective in providing timely decisions, which in most cases take only 24-48 hours to take, there are great concerns over its independence, transparency, and accessibility. They note that CAS is closely linked with the International Olympic Committee (IOC), which undermines the idea of neutrality, and due to no open attitude, the state raises questions about accountability. Moreover, a small number of representatives of athletes in decision-making bodies brings imbalance between strong institutions and individual sportspersons.

This brings up the main issue that whether the dispute resolution mechanism that currently exists within the Olympics is indeed effective being able to achieve its goal of understanding justice as well as preserving the integrity of sport. The current system puts emphasis on speed and efficiency yet it is not clear that such is at the cost of fairness, athlete rights and the long-term plausibility of the Olympic movement. It is therefore high time call into question the dispute resolution in the Olympics and to name a few gaps in the system, as well as suggest reforms that can be applied to make the structure be more transparent, balanced, and athlete-focused.

3. Literature Review

According to the literature on sports dispute resolution and especially the scenario during the Olympics', specialized processes are required for the purpose that are quick as well as equitable in the sporting events at the international levels are unique. The research and practice activities of different aspects of dispute resolution such as the role of arbitration, the efficacy of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), and issues pertaining to transparency, independence and athlete representation have been covered by scholars and practitioners.

1) It exists in sports contest resolution and arbitration.
According to Mitten and Opie (2019), it has turned into the superstructure of sports dispute resolution as arbitration allows a quicker, more agile, and private mechanism in comparison to traditional combat courts. They dwell on the fact that, due to the complexity of international sports, and with the factor of commercial and ethical concerns, an international sports tribunal is required to have knowledge of sports law, and not general legal principles. Arbitration enables the parties to solve disputes without interfering with the competitions taking place thus may be very appropriate in mega-events such as Olympics.

2) Court of Arbitration for sport (CAS)
Nafziger (2018) singles out CAS as the best organization of settling international sports disputes, and their Ad Hoc Division was created to work with the Olympics. One of the strengths brought by CAS is the capacity to release decisions within hours of time to make sure that athletes are not deprived of their right to take part in the incident unfairly. Blackshaw (2020) also mentions that CAS is more balanced between legal rigor and practicality; however, he refers to issues of transparency as well as the perceived proximity of CAS to the IOC. Among case studies, especially that of Claudia Pechstein and Caster Semenya, one can see that the one who tend to conclude CAS is at the center of conclusion of these issues with both legal and moral consequences.

3) Doping and Disputes of Resolution
The efficacy of both WADA (World Anti-Doping Agency) and CAS in regard to doping has widely appeared in the literature. According to Donnelly (2017), worse still the majority of Olympic cases, taken to CAS, have been the doping disputes, especially when there is a systemic scandal like the Russian doping case. Researchers believe that though CAS offers a fast judgment, scientific evidence in cases on doping is so complex that there is great difficulty in fair judgement.

4) Rights and Governance of the Athlete.

The necessity of the rights of the athletes and ensuring that the athlete is fairly represented in the dispute resolution mechanism is highlighted by scholars like McLaren (2016) and Jennings (2019). In the same breath, they claim that CAS, even with its efficiency, is likely to start institutional concerns, and not individual athlete concerns at that. Areas of concern still include transparency, access to legal resources, as well as, decision-making processes.

4. Research Gap

Although a lot of literature can be found on CAS and sports arbitration, there are still gaps in it. To begin with, weak empirical attachments of the functionality of CAS Ad Hoc Division at Olympic Games are available. Second, few studies involve critical examination of the speed versus fairness ratio of decision-making, or the extent to which the athlete is involved in decision-making. Third, there is limited experience of comparative studies between CAS and other international sports tribunal or arbitration mechanisms (FIFA, or ICC). Lastly, there are the upcoming issues, including controversies related to gender eligibility, doping detection applications, and commerce in the fourth phase of digital technologies that should further be studied.

5. Research Objective

1) CAS in resolving Olympic disputes is very Effective
2) To understand the types of disputes that are most common during the Olympics
3) To understand whether the current system is fair & independent
4) To examine the structure and functioning of CAS.
5) To analyze major disputes during the Olympics.
6) To evaluate strengths and weaknesses of current mechanisms.
7) To suggest reforms for better protection of athlete rights.

6. Hypothesis

The CAS Ad Hoc Division provides a fast and effective mechanism for Olympic disputes, but it lacks adequate transparency and athlete participation, which may affect fairness.

7. Scope and Limitations

This analysis involves the dispute resolution mechanisms of Olympic Games with a direct focus on the Court of Arbitration for Sport and its Ad Hoc Division which works during any Olympic Games. The study will analyze the different kinds of conflicts that are usually caused by the Olympic set up and the contradictions that are usually involved in the Olympics scanners in form of doping along with the eligibility and nationality conflicting issues, discipline issues and the Olympic issues of sponsorship and broadcasting worries. It also examines the legal and procedural framework of the CAS and interaction with the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and international federations, the enforcement of CAS awards by way of international conventions, especially that of the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards. The study will further critically assess the effectiveness, efficiency, and fairness of CAS proceedings in terms of advantages, including speed, specialized knowledge and enforcement, but weaknesses including limited transparency, possible conflict of interests and lack of athlete representation. The study will evaluate these aspects in an attempt to pinpoint the deficiencies within the existing system and recommend reforms that will result in a better Olympic dispute resolution mechanism in terms of credibility and fairness.

In spite of the generalized nature, the research possesses some weaknesses. First, access to confidential CAS proceedings under the Ad Hoc Division is limited, and hence this implies that primary data will be not available. Second, the studies have concentrated more on the recent Olympic Games and international dispute resolution tools and may not capture the concerns out in history and the working of national sporting tribunals. Third, the research lacks interviews with sportspeople, officials, or CAS arbitrators and uses the secondary sources, the case law, and the official reports to assess efficacy and equity. Lastly, sports law evolves extremely fast, as regulations in the field of anti-doping, gender limitations, contracts and various online frameworks keep on changing, implying that the results show a one-point-in-time picture as opposed to a long-term trend. In spite of those limits, the research offers the analytical and doctrinal evaluation of the dispute resolution during Olympics in detail which gives some critical aspects of dispute resolution functioning, its problems, and ways to reform it.

8. Research Methodology

The methodology designed in this research is doctrinal and analytical as called, within the area of interest in seeking the examination and legislation of the legal texts, case law, statutes and worldwide contracts related to Olympic dispute resolution. It is possible to conduct a systematic analysis of the legal framework of the Court of Arbitration, Ad Hoc Division, and other institutions implementing the disagreements procedure in the framework of the Olympic Games using the doctrinal approach. The paper examines the effectiveness of the procedures and substantive nature of CAS rulings, interacting between the Olympic Charter, the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) Code, and other sources of law on the issue by seeking to assess a satisfactory solution to comparable cases on time.

Moreover, there is also a comparison that puts the CAS against the bigger spectrum of sports dispute resolution. This involves comparison and contrasting CAS with other sport international tribunals across countries like FIFA Dispute Resolution Chamber, International Cricket Council (ICC) arbitration as well as the national sports tribunals in terms of similarities and differences as well as best practices. The comparative analysis assists in determining the strengths, weaknesses, and possible changes that may improve effectiveness, transparency as well as fairness of Olympic dispute resolution.

The study relies on the primary and secondary sources. The main sources shall consist of Olympic Charter, official CAS awards and rulings, WADA Code, and any international conventions concerning the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards as well as the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards. The secondary sources will occupy books, scholarly journal articles, reports and, commentaries written by experts that may have presented critical understanding of sports law, arbitration and dispute resolution practices. This meticulous approach of combining doctrinal, analytical, and comparative approach provides a holistic approach of the area and gives the study the capacity to reform the operations of the dispute resolution machineries of Olympics and subsequently come out with informed recommendation changes.

9. Development of sports dispute resolution in olympics

1) Pre-History: Power Structure and Informal Systems

Modern Olympic Games were again organized in 1896 and at that time they were under the organizations of International Olympic Committee (IOC) which had a wide discretion of dealing with disputes and fairing out a healthy competition. In early days, dispute resolution was made informal with assistance of IOC, national Olympic committees and individual sports federations to address grievances in the Games. These controversies were normally based on matters concerning eligibility of the athletes, meaning of amateurism and their contravention of the Olympic law. Nonetheless, there was a lack of a formalized system, which more often than not, led to inconsistent cases, delayed cases, and accusations of bias. Theorists have postulated that the ad-hoc interventions compromised fairness of athletes regarding Olympic discipline.[1]

2) Development of the sense of the necessity of some special mechanism.

As a sporting event, Olympic Games expanded in size, nature and commercialization incumbency, the shortcomings of informal dispute resolution were all the more evident. As the sporting rules but also the contractual ones, the broadcasting and the anti-doping compliance were subjects of dispute, specialized legal expertise and effective delivery were a requirement, and the efficient running of the Game. Solid international arbitration bodies were promoted by the IOC to achieve the quick resolution of such urgent and technical cases.[2]

3) Founding of Court of Arbitration of Sport (CAS)

CAS was officially organized in 1984 and entered service in 1986 as an international system of deciding sportive conflicts, to ensure that arbitrators, countries and international associations can solve their problems in the most expedient and exact manner.[3] The centralization and focus of arbitration, which consisted of international arbitration, resolved several of the previous ad hoc system criticisms, including whether decisions and jurisdictions were inconsistent, and whether there even was international sports or athletic legal and technical expertise.

4) CAS Ad Hoc Division and Olympic Implementation.

CAS came up with an Ad Hoc Division in the year 1996 dedicated to the Olympic Games. The Ad Hoc Division is standing to handle some issues in real-time, with authorization to deliver a declaration between 24 and 48 hours, sometimes with doping matters, eligibility cases, all from any form of discipline or ethical matters of concern over an Olympics edition. The establishment of it was a great move in the history of Olympic dispute resolving as the rights of athletes will not be delayed without their competitions being rid. The Ad Hoc Division translates the self-interest of the IOC in its approach of incorporating procedural effectiveness and fairness in accordance with the increasing complexity and globalization of Games.[4]

5) Institutional Reforms and Legal Problems.

In spite of its success, issues on independence, transparency, and enforceability have been successful with CAS. Cases such as Gundel v. Federation Equestre Internationale also pointed to the existence of conflict of interest and suggested the loyalty of the tribunal to the IOC and other sports organisations, leading to the formation of International Council of Arbitration for Sport (ICAS) with the task of controlling CAS activities as well as maintain its independence in relation to the IOC and other sports body. Through these institutional reforms, CAS has enhanced its own credibility, rendering it to be considered the best institution in terms of settling international disputes in sports.[5]

6) Developments in Contemporary Times.

Over the past years, CAS has proceeded to cope with emerging issues in the Olympic world. New challenges like gender eligibility contests, plasma-based and AI-grown anti-doping tests, and sophisticated business scuffles have pushed the tribunal to increase its procedural guidelines and wise judgment.[6] To add to that, the subject of athlete representation and the fairness of the process always features prominently because increasing efficiency demands minimal to no trade-off. The history of CAS presents a pattern of transition between the informally ad hoc process and the specialized system of arbitration that is known globally, and it becomes dynamic because of the contemporary global sport.

10. Characteristics of Conflicts in Olymoics

Olympic Games being the main international sporting event they are bound to bring about a large array of disputes because

[1] History of the Court of Arbitration for Sport, COURT OF ARBITRATION FOR SPORT, https://www.tas-cas.org/en/general-information/history-of-the-cas.html
[2] James A.R. Nafziger, International Sports Law: An Overview 45 (2018).
[3] Ian Blackshaw, Mediating Spo
[4] Arbitration and Dispute Resolution at the Olympic Games, CLYDE & CO, https://www.clydeco.com/en/insights/2024/06/arbitration-and-dispute-resolution-at-the-olympic
[5] Gundel v. Fédération Equestre Internationale, CAS 1994/A/313.
[6] Id.; see also Court of Arbitration for Sport, International Council of Arbitration for Sport (ICAS), https://www.tas-cas.org/en/general-information/icas.html

of stakes involved, participation from various parts of the world, and the complexities involved in increasing regulations. It is vital to see what disputes are to properly recognize the importance of dedicated initiatives such as the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) in the pursuit of fair approach, transparency, and expediency. To a large extent, these issues have been identified as doping related issues, eligibility and nationality issues, disciplinary issues and commercial or contractual disputes.

1) Doping-Related Disputes

The most common and high-profile sporting issues in Olympics is doping frauds. The cases include the mention of the use of banned substances, contravention of anti-doping measures, or the protest against sanction imposition issues by the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA). As an example, when a group of Russian athletes were suspended over doping at the Rio 2016 Olympics, the case became world-renowned due to the rush to resolve the case, which shows the high sensitivity and reasoning of the case in relation to international competitions.

2) Disputes of Eligibility and of Nationality

Among the matters related to eligibility are the questions on the age, gender, citizenship, or qualification of an athlete. The famous examples are the dilemmas regarding sportspeople, such as Caster Semenya, who is not only eligible to compete in women races but has caused intercountry issues related to gender testing and the needs to embrace inclusion and equity.[7] Cases of nationality are also evident when a sportsman becomes a competitor of a different country or when one competitor is a dual citizen. They do not always concern one legal framework only, as they may involve national laws, Olympic Charter, and international regulations of sport.[8]

3) Disciplinary and Ethical Disputes

Disciplinary controversies are linked with the unsportsmanlike behaviour, the violation of Olympic regulations, or the offense of ethics. They can include respondents to political protests on the medal ceremony stage, misbehavior on the field, or even rivalry between sportspeople and coaches, or federations. Sanctions or an alternative way out of such disputes is therefore given the powers of the IOC and CAS under the Olympic Charter to apply sanctions or decide such disputes to ensure the integrity of the Games and its acceptability.[9] Disciplinary disputes can be quite a sensitive issue, because it is not just about timing but a sportsman violating a rule.

4) Commercial and Contractual Disputes

Disputes in commercial relationship in Olympics can take the form of differences in terms of broadcasting, sponsorship or even in terms of licensing. The Games are very much commercialized and in some instances some disputes between sponsors, broadcasters and organizational committees have taken the turn to arbitration. CAS is the place where such issues can be corrected in a manner that does not infringe upon contractual obligations and integrity of the Games.

5) New and Controversial Disputes

Over the last few years, the incidences of new forms of dispute have been gaining traction such as technological controversies, detection of doping in esports by use of AI, eligibility in esports, and privacy rights. These conflicts usually need special skills and speed to avoid derailing of competencies. Such dispute develops points to the larger societal and technological shifts, which require the further development of the dispute resolution system in the Olympics.[10]

To Conclude, the essence of Olympic controversies creates the need of special, effective and unprejudiced apparatus. CAS and especially its Ad Hoc Division have largely played a critical role in determining these conflicts on timely basis without undermining procedural fairness. The concept of conflicts offers a perspective on what the Olympic movement must handle, as well as understanding the changing needs of relationship solutions in the world of international sport by unraveling the nature of the conflicts, i.e., the doping, eligibility, disciplinary, and commercial conflicts.

11. Role and Function Of CAS

1) Organization and authority

The Court of Arbitration of Sport (CAS) is an entity that serves as the main dispute resolution appellate entity in sporting events in the international scene such as the Olympic sports.[11] The scope of its work is impressive, and very few issues are left to CAS which cannot find a respected and professional way to judge a case with the lack of expertise that is in law and sport governance and any technical aspects of detection and deterrence, coupled with sports-related commercial contracts, however under the wing of the International Council of Arbitration of Sport, watchdog over CAS that makes sure that only this highly independent body takes judicial decisions.[12]

2) CAS Ad Hoc Division the Olympics

To deal with the special time concern of disputes in the Olympic Games, CAS formed Ad Hoc Division in 1996, which was available on a temporary basis during each Olympics Games in order to rationally enable the athletes to compete without holding them any longer.[13]It largely deals with doping cases, international eligibility cases based on nationality, age or sex, disciplinary cases and emergent commercial cases which have an impact to the Games. The Ad Hoc Division is one that can be celebrated as an example of the CAS principle of balancing the efficiency of the procedures with maintaining the legal dignity of the proceedings and ensuring that the Olympics competitions of

[7] Caster Semenya v. IAAF, CAS 2019/A/6467.
[8] Olympic Charter, Rule 41, International Olympic Committee (2020).
[9] IOC Disciplinary Commission Procedures, International Olympic Committee, https://olympics.com/ioc/disciplinary-commission
[10] McLaren, Richard, Gender and Anti-Doping: Recent Developments in Sports Arbitration, 14 J. SPORTS L. & POL'Y 67 (2019).
[11] Court of Arbitration for Sport, International Council of Arbitration for Sport (ICAS), https://www.tas-cas.org/en/general-information/icas.html
[12] Olympic Charter, R. 59, International Olympic Committee (2020
[13] Code of Sports-related Arbitration, Court of Arbitration for Sport (2020), https://www.tas-cas.org/en/arbitration/code-of-sport-related-arbitration.html

high stakes will not be destabilized or shaken by the athletes and the federations.

3) Procedure and Enforcement of Awards

The proceedings CAS have will adhere to the Code of Sports-related Arbitration that covers the specific rules in the process of arbitration, evidence presentation, hearing, and appeal in detail and though this has ensured the privacy of the athletes the procedures have sparked debate on the issue of transparency. CAS decision making is worldwide and final and is accepted by the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign arbitral awards, and this makes the decisions taken by CAS binding and encourages other jurisdictions to respect the judgment.[14] This aspect makes the CAS decision making favorable and consistent as in as far as Olympic competition is concerned and also pretty important in that respect.

4) Landmark Olympics Disputes Case Studies

A positive trend of cases that show the keys of CAS balancing between sports integrity and athlete rights can be shown. In Claudia Pechstein v. Suspension of Doping, the tribunal was attentively examining scientific data and procedural fairness, which goes to show ISU, CAS upheld the chosen suspension of doping[15].The importance of the Ad Hoc Division in responding to urgent cases in real-time, the role of the judicial body can be broadly characterized by the IAAF case, which concerned gender eligibility rules, but triggered the world discussions of fairness and inclusion, and how the stringent ness of the rules guarantees the importance of the fairness of the established institution.[16]These and other cases demonstrate the two-sided role of the Ad Hoc Division in maintaining the quality of regulation, and ensuring both the rights of athletes and dependability of the integrity of any previously established institution.

12. Critical Analysis

1) Strengths

The Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) is blessed with a number of strengths that have made it the most preferable place to settle any dispute related to Olympics. The **speed** (the Ad Hoc Division regularly publishes decisions within 24-48 hours), which has become one of its greatest strengths, is the first facilitator of the program: the employees of the CAS can be sure of the efficiency of the process as well as of the integrity of the Olympians.[17]CAS decisions are **final and binding** and can be reliably enforced by international conventions, which ensure **continuity** across borders.[18]

2) Weaknesses

In spite of the mentioned advantages, CAS does have various criticisms of a significant nature. Its **secretive nature** has become a cause of confusion on matters of transparency, with the stakeholders being uncertain about the rationale of some initiatives, given that some athletes, particularly those in less developed countries, cannot afford counsel services or even taking part in decision-making.[19] There is also the issue of **independence** because the ideas of the CAS arbitrators may seem conflictful to the athletes, especially those of lesser populations, as some of them cannot afford attorney services or even participate in decision making. The weaknesses point to the persistent problem of the balance between efficiency and equity in high-stakes resolution of Olympic disputes.

3) Comparative Analysis

Comparative perspective indicates the strengths and weakness of CAS in comparison with other sporting dispute mechanisms. An example is that scores of FIFA at the daily arbitration level include Dispute Resolution Chamber, mainly focusing on the settlement of contractual and transfer-related disputes, which cannot compete with CAS in rapidity and instant arbitration of international competitions, but its transparency and athlete inclusiveness are less effective than those of CAS as a standard is concerned.[20]

13. Suggestions and Recommendations

As a way of ensuring equality and security of athletes, the Olympic movement ought to entertain the provision of an Independent Athlete Ombudsman. This is an office that would be a neutral on the part of championing the interests of the athletes and anything regarding dispute resolution practices and also counseling before and during the CAS proceeding. The Ombudsman would be able to offer alternative levels of support and representation to athletes particularly those representing a smaller country or limited resources which would focus on equitability and trust to the system.

Provide More CAS Proceedings Transparency. The transparency continues to be a major issue when adjudicating CAS. To overcome that, CAS may also release abstracts of rulings, litigations, and manuals and processes without leaking information that may jeopardize their security. The increased level of transparency would result in better accountability, confidence of stakeholders, and knowledge of the ruling and minimize biases or partiality. Effective indication of the reasoning of the decisions made may also provide a directional precedent to be followed in future conflicts, as well as promoting the international (sports) regulations being adhered to.

Think more Like an Athlete on Dispute Panels. The other suggestion is to appoint more athletes to the CAS panels and advisory committees, especially in the case of Ad Hoc Division of the Olympics. Incorporation of former or current athletes into any dispute resolution process would offer viable information, enhance idleness, and state of affairs that the

[14] Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, June 10, 1958, 330 U.N.T.S. 38.
[15] Claudia Pechstein v. ISU, CAS 2009/A/1910.
[16] Court of Arbitration for Sport, CAS 2016/O/4667, Russian Olympic Committee v. International Olympic Committee (2016).
[17] Arbitration and Dispute Resolution at the Olympic Games, CLYDE & CO, https://www.clydeco.com/en/insights/2024/06/arbitration-and-dispute-resolution-at-the-olympic
[18] Court of Arbitration for Sport, International Council of Arbitration for Sport (ICAS), https://www.tas-cas.org/en/general-information/icas.htm
[19] McLaren, Richard, Gender and Anti-Doping: Recent Developments in Sports Arbitration, 14 J. SPORTS L. & POL'Y 67 (2019).
[20] FIFA Dispute Resolution Chamber, FIFA, https://www.fifa.com/legal/drc/

choices concern the viewpoints of people at the point of contact. This may also improve quality and become more reputable to the embassies.

Last but not least, harmonization of dispute resolution bodies between the state and national tribunals and the international dispute resolving organization such as CAS would enhance uniformity, effectiveness and availability. A common set of procedures and similar guidelines in cross- jurisdictional boundaries would diminish situations of conflict of jurisdiction, eliminate repetition of identical engagement, and would assist in a consistent and more foreseeable system of handling conflicts. Such synthesis would eventually enhance the general honesty and reliability of the sports administration in the Olympic arena.

14. Conclusion

The Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) has proved to be the mainstay of the dispute resolution in Olympic Games, as it presents a crucial means of making sure that justice and integrity is done and disputes are resolved promptly. Its Ad Hoc Division, which manages every Games, is a perfect example of having a fast system in place, and it frequently arrives in 24 and 48 hours, not subjecting athletes to much time of indecision. With its knowledge of the sports-related law, anti-doping provisions, eligibility and commercial agreements, CAS makes sure that controversies are solved with the technicality and legal perceptions keeping the integrity of the Olympic movement intact at the international front.

However, the limitations of the CAS system do exist regardless of its obvious positive features. Perceptions of fairness are still concerned by the issues on transparency, independence and representation of its athletes. The effectiveness of protecting sensitive information by means of confidential proceedings can facilitate clouding the grounds of decision-making and diminish accountability. Also, one might extend the inconvenience to athletes in smaller countries or of lower access to the counsel of their own, indicating that tools to better represent and assist the voices of the athletes are necessary. These issues point to the fact that the structure changes are required in order to be able to address the balance between efficiency and justice as well as make CAS effective and fair.

In the future, the Olympic dispute resolution structure has challenges that are being felt that may challenge the flexibility of the system. The adoption of tools of artificial intelligence and sophisticated technologies into the field of doping detection makes the subject of evidence, equity, and provides legal and ethical protection complex. The issue of gender inclusiveness and eligibility like in seminal cases as Caster Semenya, remains a contextual problem that still imposes strains on existing constructs and requires well-thought scientific interpretation. In addition, the quest to integrate esports and other electronic sporting games in the Olympics brings in fresh legal challenges, pertaining to intellectual rights, legal eligibility, and contract issues.

Conclusively, although CAS concept has been very successful in addressing disputes in quick decisive manner, its applicability will be determined on how well it will adapt with the dynamic nature of international sports. Enhancing transparency, high-towards independent control, more athletes in arbitration, pro synchronizing national and international dispute are important measures in the future. This set of issues can be effectively preempted by the Olympic movement to maintain the integrity, fairness, and credibility of the Games across all parts of the world and guarantee the role, interests, and rights of athletes through preserving the Olympic spirit of fair competition in an increasingly sophisticated and technologically versatile sport of international scope.

References

[1] Arbitration and Dispute Resolution at the Olympic Games, CLYDE & CO, https://www.clydeco.com/en/insights/2024/06/arbitration-and-dispute-resolution-at-the-olympic
[2] Charles Russell Speechlys LLP, An Overview of the Court of Arbitration for Sport, https://www.charlesrussellspeechlys.com/en/insights/expert-insights/dispute-resolution/2024/an-overview-of-the-court-of-arbitration-for-sport/
[3] Claudia Pechstein v. ISU, CAS 2009/A/1910.
[4] Caster Semenya v. IAAF, CAS 2019/A/6467.
[5] Court of Arbitration for Sport, Code of Sports-related Arbitration (2020), https://www.tas-cas.org/en/arbitration/code-of-sport-related-arbitration.html
[6] Court of Arbitration for Sport, History of the Court of Arbitration for Sport, https://www.tas-cas.org/en/general-information/history-of-the-cas.html
[7] Court of Arbitration for Sport, International Council of Arbitration for Sport (ICAS), https://www.tas-cas.org/en/general-information/icas.html
[8] Court of Arbitration for Sport, CAS 2016/O/4667, Russian Olympic Committee v. International Olympic Committee (2016).
[9] Gundel v. Fédération Equestre Internationale, CAS 1994/A/313.
[10] James A.R. Nafziger, International Sports Law: An Overview 45 (2018).
[11] McLaren, Richard, Gender and Anti-Doping: Recent Developments in Sports Arbitration, 14 J. SPORTS L. & POL'Y 67 (2019).
[12] Mitten, M.J., & Opie, H., Comparative Sports Law: National vs. International Dispute Mechanisms, 22 INT'L SPORTS L. J. 101 (2020).
[13] Olympic Charter, International Olympic Committee (2020), https://olympics.com/ioc/olympic-charter
[14] FIFA Dispute Resolution Chamber, FIFA, https://www.fifa.com/legal/drc/
[15] Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, June 10, 1958, 330 U.N.T.S. 38.
[16] Ian Blackshaw, Mediating Sports Disputes 32 (202