



FIDE ETHICS & DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

The First Instance Chamber of the Ethics & Disciplinary Commission (hereafter called “the EDC Chamber”), sitting in the following composition -

Chairperson: Mr Ali Nihat Yazici

Members: Mr Khaled Arfa

Mrs Olga Baskakova

during an exchange of correspondence and online meetings, made the following -

DECISION

Case no. 6/2025: "Alleged harassment of a female player".

INTRODUCTION AND ALLEGATIONS

1. The EDC Chamber **notes** its establishment by the EDC Chairman on 13th May 2025.
2. The EDC Chamber **notes** that on the 5th May, 2025, the FIDE Ethics and Disciplinary Commission (EDC) received a complaint against GM Yoo from Ms. X, concerning allegations of harassment in violation of the FIDE Ethics & Disciplinary Code, more particularly as follows:
 - 2.1. Articles 6.1(a)—ethical value of human dignity—read with Art. 6.2 and 6.3, 6.4, 6.5(e), and 6.5(g) of the Ethics Code, Art.
 - 2.2. 11.9(a)—socially unacceptable behavior—of the Disciplinary Code,
 - 2.3. Art. 11.9(d)—acts of misbehavior—of the Disciplinary Code.

PARTIES

3. The Complainant is Ms X.
4. The Respondent is GM Christopher Woojin Yoo (FIDE ID: 30909694).
5. THE EDC Chamber **notes** that the Complainant has requested to remain anonymous in the published decision, as well as the identities of the witnesses. Their identities are known to the EDC Panel and the Respondent. In accordance with Rule 64 of the EDC Procedural Rules, the witnesses will therefore be identified as Witness A and Witness B.
6. The EDC Chamber **notes** that the Respondent was given the opportunity to respond to the complaint by way of notice dated 13th May 2025. On 22nd May 2025, the Respondent requested an extension to respond, and this request was subsequently granted.
7. The EDC Chamber **notes** that the Respondent appointed Mr. Young Kyo Yoo as his representative on 15th May 2025 by means of a power of attorney. Following the submission of another power of attorney on 21st May 2025, Mr. John Cox was appointed as the second representative. The Respondent designated the former representative as the sole contact person.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The content of the case file

8. The EDC Chamber **notes** the contents of the following documents received as part of the case file: the Complaint of Ms. X (13th May 2025 – 3 pages) along with its exhibits (30 pages) and two testimonies (2 pages), the notice of respondent sent by the EDC Chamber (13th May 2025), and the Respondent's response dated 12th June 2025 (3 pages) with its exhibits (66 pages).
9. The EDC Chamber **notes** that, in addition to the documents, there is also non-categorized communication between the Chamber Chair and the Respondent, the Complainant, and/or both parties regarding the procedures and their questions.

Grounds of Complaint

10. The EDC Chamber **notes** the subject matter of the Complaint and the defensive statements submitted:
 - 10.1. The Complainant submitted a complaint against the Respondent, involving several incidents of alleged inappropriate behavior by the Respondent
 - 10.2. The Complainant is a FIDE rated player. The Respondent is a GM (Grand

Master).

- 10.3. The Complainant stated in her complaint that the incidents took place during two tournaments.

Incident 1: Grenke Open (17th -21st April 2025)

- 10.4. In her complaint, Ms. X described the beginning and development of incidents in the 21st Grenke Open. According to Ms. X's account, the Respondent joined the group consisting of Ms. X and her friends, all of whom were players in the tournament, on the night after the round. She alleges that the Respondent exhibited strange and inappropriate behavior at that time, such as wanting to kiss her and other players. She stated that both she and the other players rejected these advances and that the Respondent took a selfie with the group. Although she did not give the matter much importance at the time, she emphasized that she found it weird.
- 10.5. The Complainant recounted that on the following day (22nd April 2025), the Respondent posted one of the group photos taken the previous day on his Instagram page. Witness A, who is also a witness in the case, had allowed the Respondent to take the photo but explicitly asked him not to share it on social media. Upon learning this, Ms. X contacted the Respondent and requested that he remove the photo from the post, which the Respondent complied with.

Incident 2: Sardinia World Chess Festival (26th April – 3rd May 2025)

- 10.6. The Complainant stated that during the tournament held in Sardinia, the Respondent frequently followed her with his eyes, and once, he invited her to his table during a meal, which she declined by saying she was sitting elsewhere. However, during another meal, while she was sitting with her friends, the Respondent sat down uninvited in an empty chair next to her and started talking to them without being invited. While they were eating, the Respondent suddenly caught her hand, to which she reacted by leaping toward the person sitting on her other side. She stated that she was shocked by the incident.
- 10.7. The Complainant stated that on 3rd May 2025, after lunch, the Respondent followed her and two other friends to the area of the hotel where the rooms were located. After she entered her room, one of her friends sent her a message

saying, *“Careful. He is in front of your door. Don’t open.”* She stated that the Respondent knocked on her door several times and even called out *“housekeeping”* and that he waited in front of the door for nearly 10 minutes before leaving. Ms. X also stated that the Respondent admitted the incident in his messages, as shown in the exhibits.

- 10.8. The Complainant disclosed another incident that, during the same afternoon (3rd May 2025) and before the awards ceremony, she was at the bar with her friends. Once again, the respondent came uninvited. The group told him that he was uninvited, he made her uncomfortable, and he had to leave. The Respondent argued about this, and one of the Complainant’s friends answered the Respondent that they cared about her and asked the Respondent to leave her alone. The Respondent answered that he wanted to celebrate the tournament.
- 10.9. The Complainant stated that later the same day, when she came down to the hotel lobby to go out with her friends, the Respondent saw her and, as she stepped outside, approached her and said, *“I want to be your boyfriend”* in front of another friend who was smoking outside. She added that he placed his hand on her shoulder, which made her disturbed.
- 10.10. The Complainant stated that one day after the tournament (4th May 2025), Witness B informed her that the Respondent had cropped one of the photos from the Grenke Party (21st April 2025) to show only Ms. X and the Respondent and posted it on Instagram with the caption *“Good memories from a long trip,”* creating the impression that they were dating. In response, Ms. X said that she lifted the block on the Respondent and asked him to remove the photo immediately. The Respondent replied, *“I don’t respect 1950 chess players. Your brain doesn’t know how to move the knight,”* and even added, *“I am an amazing chess player, a genius.”* Ms. X presented this entire exchange in the exhibits attached to her complaint.
- 10.11. The Complainant stated that when she told the Respondent she would report him to FIDE, he removed the photo from the post. She also stressed that the Respondent had lied to his father about kissing, as shown by their

communication after the incidents.

The Witness Statements of the Complainant

- 10.12. Witness A in a written witness statement corroborates the events alleged by Ms. X during the Grenke Open tournament, namely, that the Respondent attempted to kiss both Ms. X and Witness A but was rejected.
- 10.13. Witness B also corroborates in a written witness statement the events alleged by Ms. X during the Grenke Open tournament, specifically that the Respondent attempted to kiss both Ms. X and Witness A but was rejected. Witness B additionally includes in the witness statement screenshots of messages sent to him by the Respondent. Witness B further confirmed that when the Respondent grabbed Ms.X's hand during a meal, Ms. X jumped in shock and nearly left the room.

The Respondent's Submission

11. The Respondent, in his statement, answered as follows:

- 11.1. The Respondent addressed the allegations made by the Complainant individually and provided an explanation of the situation from his point of view.
- 11.2. Regarding the incidents alleged in the complaint, the Respondent claimed that he misread the situation due to reasons disclosed to the Panel.
- 11.3. The Respondent confirmed that he took Ms. X's hand at the dinner table without her permission. He confirmed that, later the same day, he waited for 10 minutes outside her hotel room and knocked on the door several times.

Personal testimony of the Respondent

- 11.4. The Respondent in his testimony stated that there were hugs during the events, that he tried to kiss Witness A and Ms. X but was rejected, and that at the bar they visited as a large group, he sat close to Ms. X, a gesture which he misinterpreted. He further states that he did not think he might have made Ms. X uncomfortable at the time and acknowledges that he misunderstood the situation.
- 11.5. In his testimony, the Respondent sincerely expresses regret for the incidents, acknowledges his inexperience in social relationships, and conveys remorse

for the mistakes he made.

Testimony of the father of the Respondent

- 11.6. In his statement, Mr. Y.K. Yoo describes the sequence of events and provides explanations regarding the Respondent's social limitations. His testimony generally outlines the Respondent's development as an individual in chess, disclosure of a medical condition, and the treatment he has received.
- 11.7. Mr. Y.K. Yoo submitted that the incidents during the Grenke Open and Sardinia tournaments were reported by the chess media, and after that the Respondent received death threats by e-mail. He emphasizes that the potential banning of the Respondent from playing chess—the only activity that connects him to real life—would be a serious concern for his life and the future.
- 11.8. As the Respondent's father, Mr. Y.K. Yoo expresses deep sorrow and regret over the events, stating in writing that the Respondent has been profoundly affected by the developments from a psychiatric standpoint.

Possible Consequences Document

- 11.9. The Respondent has submitted a set of projections, assuming the potential consequences of a possible sanction and the sanctions in power the Respondent faces, in addition to their statements. In this submission, they state that due to the one-year suspension and five-year probation period imposed by the USCF, the Respondent suffered significant financial and emotional losses. They further note that the sanction has become global following the FIDE decision in Case 5/2025 (A), which has aggravated the situation for them. They state that this will negatively impact the educational scholarship the Respondent may receive.
- 11.10. The Respondent does not object to the admissibility of the complaint.
- 11.11. The Respondent declares themselves not guilty of the alleged violations of the EDC Rules.
- 11.12. The Respondent requested an oral hearing on this matter but also provides written submissions in case such a hearing is not granted.
- 11.13. The Respondent generally asserts that not every breach of etiquette constitutes a violation of the Rules, and that for the alleged conduct to qualify as a

violation, it must reach a certain level of seriousness.

- 11.14. Regarding Articles 6.1(a) and 6.2, the Respondent asserts that these articles are connected to Article 6.3, and from the perspective of Article 6.3, the only action that could be considered contrary to these values is the exchange of mutually insulting messages. The Respondent claims that this messaging was initiated by the Complainant, who used profanity, threats, and possibly—even if unintentionally—an insult targeting Christopher’s disability.
- 11.15. Regarding Article 6.4, the Respondent states that no physical or mental harm, whether intentional or accidental, has been alleged.
- 11.16. Regarding Article 6.5 and the definition of harassment, the Respondent argues that the conduct in question does not constitute harassment as defined in the Rules, as it was not systematic or hostile in nature, was not repeated, and did not aim to isolate or exclude anyone, nor did it result in such an outcome.
- 11.17. The Respondent asserts that the only act that could potentially be claimed as a violation of Article 6.5(e) is the exchange of insulting messages initiated by the Complainant.
- 11.18. The Respondent argues that, with respect to Article 6.5(g), no act of a sexual nature occurred, nor has such an allegation been made.
- 11.19. The Respondent claims that the conduct in question does not fall under the scope of Article 11.9(a), and for it to be considered as such, a certain level of seriousness must be reached.
- 11.20. The Respondent asserts that, under Article 11.9(d), the Complainant has not suffered any mental harm, and therefore no offense was committed in this context either.
- 11.21. The Respondent believes that, since the Respondent has declared himself not guilty, no sanction should be imposed. However, in the event that a violation is found, they request the consideration of the mitigating factors and they offer a suitable sanction.

Suitable sanction requested by the Respondent

- 11.22. In his response, the Respondent proposed as follows:
 - 11.22.1. A period of one year (subject to annual reassessment) to be permitted to

- compete but under close supervision by a parent or designated guardian,
- 11.22.2. To be restricted from activities without supervision with his peers except during official competition play,
- 11.22.3. To be restricted from communication on social media or online private communication during tournaments.

ADMISSIBILITY

12. For the Complaint to be admissible, it must meet the minimum substantive requirements set out in Article 5 of the EDC Code.

- 12.1. The Complainant is a FIDE-rated player and has the necessary standing to submit the complaint. (5.1.a)
- 12.2. The Respondent is a FIDE-rated player holding the GM title and is a member of the FIDE family. (5.1.b)
- 12.3. The allegations made and the documents submitted as part of the complaint indicate, at least prima facie, that multiple provisions of the FIDE Ethics and Disciplinary Code have been violated (5.1.c).
- 12.4. The alleged misconduct took place during the Grenke Open (17th – 21st April 2025) and the Sardinia World Chess Festival (26th April–3rd May 2025), both of which are international tournaments held in the international sphere. (5.1.d)
- 12.5. The alleged incidents occurred within one month prior to the date the complaint was submitted to FIDE EDC. (5.1.e)
- 12.6. The Complainant is a FIDE-rated player and claims to be the direct victim of the incidents, thereby having the necessary legal standing (direct and substantial interest). (5.2 / 5.2.b)
- 12.7. Upon due consideration, the EDC Chamber unanimously finds that the complaint meets all the requirements to be admissible as requested in Articles 5.1 and 5.2 of the FIDE Ethics and Disciplinary Code.

FINDINGS

13. The EDC Chamber, following its deliberations, **unanimously finds** the following decisions:

Procedural Findings

- 13.1. The EDC Panel, considering that the factual circumstances of the case are not

complex and to ensure the anonymity of the witnesses (Rule 64), **has determined** that an oral hearing is not necessary and has decided accordingly (EDC Procedural Rules, Rule 62.1).

Findings regarding the alleged offenses

- 13.2. The EDC Chamber **notes** that FIDE values and strongly supports chess players competing in a safe and respectful environment. FIDE extends this environment to include all individuals within the FIDE family—such as FIDE officials, arbiters, volunteers, media, fair play, and tournament staff—and considers it equally important that they carry out their duties in the same spirit. An essential part of this support is to encourage and empower victims to report violations that fall under Art. 6 of the FIDE Ethics and Disciplinary Code, thereby helping to preserve a safe environment.
- 13.3. The EDC Chamber **finds** it useful to reiterate the following findings established in FIDE EDC Case 3/2024, and they are supportive of the precedent in the mentioned case.
- 13.3.1. *“CASE 3/2024 – 10.1. Sexual harassment and sexual abuse in the world of sports have become a more spoken about matter in Sports in recent times with the advocacy of the ‘me too’ movement, and the support victims have received to encourage them to speak up.”*
- 13.3.2. *“CASE 3/2024 - 10.2 Sexual harassment and abuse (SHA) have ‘severe and long-term physical, psychological, social, and performance-related consequences.’¹ It is understood that the true impact on the victim is “based on a subjective experience of a situation as uncomfortable, asymmetric in terms of power, and unwanted in terms of actions.” Lack of consent, or key terms like “unwanted” and “unwelcome,” are the root of SHA.*

¹ Zaksaitė, S. (2022). *Sexual harassment and abuse in sport: Some legal and criminological considerations*. <https://doi.org/10.15388/CrimLithuan.2022.10.5>

Art. 6.1(a) – read with Art. 6.2 and 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 (e), and 6.5 (g)

- 13.4. The EDC Chamber unanimously **finds** that the Respondent's actions constitute a violation of Article 6.1(a) of the EDC Code on Human Dignity, due to the distress and psychological harm caused to the victim, even if the Respondent did not intend to cause harm.
- 13.5. The EDC Chamber **notes** the defense of the Respondent regarding the alleged violation of Article 6.1(a) of the EDC Code. The Respondent argues that he should not be judged according to the same standards as normal adults. Under the FIDE Ethics and Disciplinary Code and Procedural Rules, there is no exceptional provision that determines whether an individual's psychological condition or illness affects their culpability for violations. In other words, in cases involving violations under Article 6, factors such as the psychological state of the offender, whether the act was committed under severe stress, or whether the individual is of legal age do not alter whether a violation occurred. Such special circumstances are only considered as mitigating factors when determining the sanction to be imposed on the offender.
- 13.6. The EDC Chamber unanimously **finds** the Respondent guilty of a breach of Article 6.2 of the EDC Code. Since the Respondent's actions toward Ms. X during the two tournaments in question and on social media constitute a violation of Article 6.1(a), Article 6.2 has also been violated.
- 13.7. The EDC Chamber unanimously **finds** the Respondent guilty of a breach of Article 6.3 of the EDC Code. FIDE family members must always treat others with dignity and respect, regardless of personal or social differences (sex, religion, language, ethnicity, etc.), to uphold and promote their self-esteem (Art. 6.3). The EDC Chamber **underlines** that the Respondent's verbal insults, statements, and behavior toward Ms. X demonstrate a violation of Article 6.3.
- 13.8. The EDC Chamber unanimously **finds** the Respondent guilty of a breach of Article 6.4 of the EDC Code. The EDC Chamber **notes** the following deliberation to the defense of the Respondent regarding the alleged violation of Article 6.4 of the EDC Code. It is strictly prohibited by the Code to infringe on the dignity of an individual, and all forms of harassment are explicitly prohibited (Art 6.4).

- 13.9. The Respondent, in its defense, argues that there is no allegation of any physical or mental injuries in the official complaint. However, the Chamber believes that his actions can cause significant psychological harm to the Complainant. The violation constitutes an offense under Article 6.4.
- 13.10. The EDC Chamber **notes** that “harassment” is defined in Art 6.5 of the Code. *“Harassment refers to systematic, hostile and repeated acts intended to isolate or ostracise a person or group and affect the dignity of a person or group.”.*
- 13.11. In particular, Art. 6.5 (e) defines psychological abuse as *“any treatment that may diminish the sense of identity, dignity or self-worth, and may include without limitation any unwelcome act such as confinement, isolation, verbal assault, humiliation, or infantilization.”.*
- 13.12. The EDC Chamber **unanimously finds** the Respondent guilty of a breach of Article 6.5(e) of the EDC Code.
- 13.13. In response to this allegation, the Respondent argues in its defense that the Respondent’s actions toward Ms. X were not repeated multiple times, that the behavior in question was neither hostile nor systematic, and that it was not intended to, nor did it result in, isolating anyone.
- The EDC Chamber **notes** that persistently showing obsessive interest in the same person over a period of time and on social media; attempting to kiss her; following her; and grabbing her hand in public when she is with her friends; and knocking on her the door of the hotel room for several minutes are collectively considered repeated acts of harassment. In such cases, what matters is not the harasser’s intent but the fact that they repeatedly and insistently engage in conduct that causes psychological fear, discomfort, and distress to the other party.
- 13.14. Chess is a sport in which it is evident that each player can be psychologically affected by such harassment and that this can influence their performance. It is highly likely that this would have a negative psychological impact on the ability to play, especially if the person must compete in the same environment as the harasser. FIDE places great importance on ensuring that all players are able to perform at the chessboard without any negative external influences and

supports the establishment of all necessary conditions to achieve this.

- 13.15. The EDC Chamber unanimously **finds** the Respondent guilty of a breach of Article 6.5 (g) of the EDC Code. Article 6.5(g) clearly and unequivocally states that verbal and non-verbal sexually explicit behavior constitutes a violation.
- 13.16. Art 6.5 (g) defines sexual harassment to mean *“unwanted and unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature, whether verbal, non-verbal, or physical. The assessment is based on whether a reasonable person, in the given cultural and contextual circumstances, would regard the conduct as undesirable or offensive.”*
- 13.17. Article 6.5(g) defines a violation based on whether a reasonable person, considering the cultural and contextual circumstances, would view the behavior as unwanted and offensive.
- 13.18. The EDC Chamber **finds** that the Respondent’s actions fit this definition. Moreover, interpreting such behavior as childish or attempting to justify it through social labels, modernity, or tolerance is not acceptable when there is a clear statement and complaint from the victim indicating that she felt disturbed. In determining whether harassment occurred, the victim’s declaration that she experienced the behavior as intimidation is one of the most crucial elements. Furthermore, witness testimonies have corroborated nearly all of the violations committed by the Respondent.
- 13.19. The EDC Chamber **finds** that the Respondent is guilty of violating Art. 6.1(a). Article 11.9 (a) of the Disciplinary Code Art. 6.1(a).
- 13.20. The EDC Chamber unanimously **finds** the Respondent guilty of a breach of Art 11.9(a) of the EDC Code.
- 13.21. Article 11.9(a) speaks of socially unacceptable behavior as an offense—misbehavior of a personal nature that is generally unacceptable by normal social standards, or a failure to comply with normally accepted standards of courtesy and chess etiquette.
- 13.22. The EDC Chamber **finds** that Respondent’s aforementioned actions were directed toward the same person and were repeated at different times and in various settings, constituting a violation of Art 11.9(a).

Article 11.9(d) of the Disciplinary Code

- 13.23. The EDC Chamber unanimously **finds** the Respondent guilty of a breach of Art. 11.9(d) of the EDC Code.
- 13.24. While presenting its defense regarding this allegation, the Respondent argues that, according to the provision, a violation requires the individual to have been mentally harmed and that the Complainant has not made such a complaint or allegation.
- 13.25. However, Article 11.9(d) first lists actions committed against individuals, groups, or events, and then emphasizes that such acts include “*the infliction of physical or mental harm on others.*” Moreover, the article implies that the scope of a violation may be broader.
- 13.26. Ms. X, in her complaint, articulates the profound psychological impact the incidents had on her as follows: “*I was lucky enough to be surrounded throughout the tournament by my friends who were there, but I'm afraid to imagine what might have happened if I would have been alone with him. At a certain point, I couldn't walk around the resort on my own without fear of running into him.*”
- 13.27. The EDC Chamber **notes** that it should not be expected that a victim who has experienced harassment must provide formal documentation, “such as a report,” to prove the fear and anxiety she felt as a result. The testimonies of Witness A and Witness B, the official complaint of Ms. X, and the defense of the Respondent support Ms. X's statement about the anxiety and fear she experienced following the incidents, making that fear plausible.
- 13.28. The EDC Chamber unanimously **finds** the Respondent guilty of a breach of Art 6.1(a), 11.9(a), and Art 11.9(d) of the EDC Code.

DECISION

14. Accordingly, and considering all of the above, the EDC Chamber unanimously decides as follows:

- 14.1. The Respondent is found **guilty** of Article 6.1(a), read with 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4 of the Ethics Code.
- 14.2. The Respondent is found **guilty** of Articles 6.5(e) and 6.5(g) of the Code.

- 14.3. The Respondent is found **guilty** of Article 11.9(a) of the Disciplinary Code.
- 14.4. The Respondent is found **guilty** of Article 11.9(d) of the Disciplinary Code.
- 14.5. The EDC Chamber finds, in accordance with Rule 39.6 of the EDC Procedural Rules and Article 14.3 of the EDC Code, the following aggravating and mitigating factors:

Aggravating factors

- 14.5.1. THE EDC Chamber **notes** that the following sanction is an aggravating factor for the Respondent.
 - 14.5.1.1. The Respondent is currently serving a one-year world-wide sanction (ends by the 14th November 2025) imposed under CASE 5/2025 (A). This sanction was issued by the USCF during the US Championships due to an incident in which GM Yoo punched a female broadcast official, and it has been enforced globally. As a result of this case, the Respondent was found guilty of violating Article 6.8, Article 11.9(a), Article 11.9(d), and Article 11.9(e) of the EDC Code.
 - 14.5.1.2. The Respondent will be on probation for five years after the sanction has expired, i.e. until 14th November 2030. (CASE 5/2025 (A))
 - 14.5.1.3. The EDC Chamber **finds** this as an aggravating factor for the Respondent.

Mitigating factors

- 14.5.2. The EDC Chamber **finds** the following mitigating factors for a suitable sanction:
 - 14.5.2.1. The Respondent has cooperated with the EDC Chamber by providing all requested information.
 - 14.5.2.2. The Respondent is observed to be young and inexperienced.
 - 14.5.2.3. In his defense, the Respondent expressed regret that Ms. X felt uncomfortable due to the incidents and showed remorse for his actions.
 - 14.5.2.4. The EDC Chamber was presented with compelling evidence of a medical condition disclosed, which will remain confidential, which forms a significant mitigating impact on the sanction. The EDC Chamber notes that the implementation of the Doctor's recommendations is the responsibility of the Respondent's family.

- 14.5.2.5. The EDC Chamber **notes** that the definition section of Annex 1 of the EDC Code includes the following under “Vulnerable Groups”:

“Vulnerable Groups: groups of people (minors, women, elderly people, malnourished people, prisoners, migrants and refugees, people who use drugs, and people who are ill or immune-compromised, etc.) who, due to factors usually considered outside their control, do not have the same opportunities as other, more fortunate groups in society.”

The EDC Chamber **acknowledges** that persons with disabilities, as members of this group, may have their condition considered as a mitigating factor.

- 14.5.2.6. The EDC Chamber **notes** that similar circumstances have also been recognized as mitigating factors in proceedings conducted by CAS.

- 14.5.2.6.1. In **CAS 2005/A/951 – WADA v. STTF**, a mentally disabled table tennis player tested positive for a banned substance. The World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) appealed the decision of the Singapore Table Tennis Federation (STTF), which had opted not to impose a sanction. However, the CAS panel found that due to the athlete’s **severe intellectual disability**, there was no intent or negligence involved, and the athlete lacked the cognitive capacity to understand or control their actions. As a result, CAS upheld the decision not to impose a sanction. This case is a significant precedent recognizing that **mental disability can eliminate criminal or disciplinary responsibility** in sports law.

- 14.5.2.6.2. In **CAS 2014/A/3876—IAAF v. Russian Athletics Federation & Athlete**, the case concerned a Russian athlete who had violated anti-doping rules. During the proceedings, it was revealed that the athlete had been diagnosed with schizophrenia, a serious mental disorder. While the Court upheld the anti-doping violation, it acknowledged the athlete’s psychiatric condition as a mitigating factor. The sanction imposed took into account the mental health diagnosis, reducing the athlete’s level of culpability. This case established that serious mental

illness may affect the assessment of intent and responsibility and can lead to a more lenient sanction in disciplinary cases.

15. FIDE EDC **finds** that the responsibility and authority to implement the recommendations of the Respondent's doctor lies with the Respondent's family (i.e., the legal guardian or family). FIDE has neither such a responsibility nor a process for it, and there is no corresponding procedure within the FIDE EDC Code or the Procedural Rules. Therefore, the proposed suitable sanction of the Respondent is not applicable.
16. **GM Christopher Woojin Yoo** is sanctioned to a worldwide **ban** from participating as a player in any FIDE-rated tournament for a period of **18 months** from the date of this decision, with **12 months** of this sanction **suspended** as a probation period. Should the Respondent commit another breach during the probationary period, the suspension shall automatically be revoked and the original sanction completely applied and added to the sanction imposed.
17. The Respondents and Complainant are referred to Chapter 7 of the EDC Procedural Rules and advised that this decision may be appealed to the EDC Appeal Chamber by giving written notice of such appeal to the EDC Chairperson (ethics@fide.com) within 21 days from the date upon which this decision is received. The notice of appeal must clearly state all the grounds for the appeal. An appeal lodgment fee of 500 EUROS must at the same time be paid to the FIDE Financial Department. Failing the due exercise of this right of appeal, the EDC Chamber's decision will become final.
18. The EDC Chamber **requests** the FIDE Secretariat to communicate forthwith the decision to the Respondent and the Complainant and to publish it on the FIDE website.

DATED ON THIS 17th July 2025



CHAMBER CHAIRPERSON
FIDE ETHICS & DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION