**Email Exchange with Senior Manager of U.S. Centre for Safe Sport**

**January 15 to January 22, 25**

**Based on formal complaint January 15, 24 regarding Abuse of Process, Harassment and Cyberbullying of Respondent Ivan Desyatov who has been suspended by the U.S.Centre for SafeSport since October 18, 2024.**

**Original Complaint – November 14, 24**

**From: i-Sight <****info@safesport.i-sight.com****>
Date: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 at 12:33 AM
To:------------
Subject: ----------Submission Receipt**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |
| --- |
| SafeSport |

|  |
| --- |
| You have just submitted an Incident Report from the SafeSport Incident Report[Web-Portal.](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fsafesport.i-sight.com%2Fportal&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577009420719%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=GxNPxlqWvxR0ShwXvkIiN8qqz2UBmxRw5i5A8YGR9Dk%3D&reserved=0)A copy of the incident report submitted is attached. |

 |

**From:-------------
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 1:45 AM
To: Media Requests Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Subject: ----------Submission Receipt**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

[https://drive.proton.me/urls/7VERMQZ16C#8uXFegZwbmfo](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdrive.proton.me%2Furls%2F7VERMQZ16C%238uXFegZwbmfo&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577009340337%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=Xk4ZbMZTf%2Fey0%2BoH7K2IsJXr7HymrXic6%2Bk%2FI1r8x9E%3D&reserved=0)

[https://www.tumblr.com/bvdomination](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.tumblr.com%2Fbvdomination&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577009367021%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=8Jx9lO6wDD3V3pYXjgjlhSZljg3XfR4eJnHn0qZF4g0%3D&reserved=0)

[https://vimeo.com/1046260433](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fvimeo.com%2F1046260433&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577009395228%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=Zrv1TjnyNWh0n5BxPS2ZgdlfiT4jvsPd%2Fm8c%2BjC%2FLVw%3D&reserved=0)

Good evening,

I have made an official report involving a deep concern regarding the U.S. Center for SafeSport’s handling of a case involving US Skater Ivan Desyatov. It appears that due process has been denied, and the situation raises significant ethical and procedural issues that require immediate attention.

Background:

The case concerns allegations made by an adult foreign competitor against Ivan Desyatov, a U.S. figure skater and Russian immigrant. Despite the absence of any verified evidence or formal investigation, the complainant has engaged in a public campaign of character assassination, severely damaging the respondent’s reputation and livelihood, therefore a complete denial of due process based on the rule of law. It states in the Ted Stevens Act that there needs to be procedural due process.  You are suspending this respondent and denying him a year of training and the loss of a season before a pre-determinate hearing.  That is causing reputational damage that you can never repair.  This is a deeply unethical process and causes real harm counter to the mission objective of SafeSport.  How are you protecting anyone here ?   This is not a case involving minors by a coach, it is a one-time he-said/she-said case between two adults who were former colleagues in a hotel room on their own private time.

The complainant, supported by a public relations agent, disseminated defamatory information through foreign media outlets. Alarmingly, her lawyer is affiliated with one of these media companies, which constitutes a conflict of interest. The dissemination also included manipulated English translations, falsely claiming a police investigation is underway. In reality, no formal police report exists—only a pre-complaint has been filed. This has been confirmed by public statements from the complainant’s representatives online as presented in the attached document link.

Critical Context Missing from the Case:

Witness accounts from several skaters indicate the complainant was severely intoxicated that evening, rendering the respondent’s actions an effort to protect her safety given her history of traumatic brain injury, erratic behavior, and severe intoxication.  She was in danger of falling or aspirating vomit and should not have been left alone in that state.  There was no other skater willing to do it out of a large group in attendance.

There is no pattern of abusive behavior, no power imbalance, and no involvement of minors.

The incident occurred outside U.S. jurisdiction, limiting the ability to conduct a formal investigation.

Despite these factors, the respondent has been suspended in what appears to be an unprecedented and unjustified decision, causing significant harm and leaving him vulnerable to cyberbullying, public denigration, and financial losses.

Concerns Regarding SafeSport’s Conduct:

Numerous concerned citizens, including myself, have contacted SafeSport to report this abuse of process and the respondent’s mistreatment. These communications highlight serious concerns about potential corruption, foreign interference, and biases. The suspension appears inconsistent with SafeSport’s Code of Ethics, especially given the lack of evidence indicating that the respondent poses a danger.

Allegations of Bias and Malice:

There is growing concern that the respondent’s treatment may be influenced by his status as a white male, Russian immigrant. He is only two years into learning English and vulnerable without familial support due to the death of his parents. SafeSport’s apparent refusal to address these legitimate concerns risks perpetuating a miscarriage of justice and raises questions about institutional bias.

If SafeSport continues to ignore these troubling facts and fails to act, this inaction could rise to the level of malice. Denying the respondent due process undermines SafeSport’s mission to protect athletes and promote fairness.  Several members of the public have expressed concern on record and have been stonewalled. I made a complaint two months ago outlining the troubling management of this case.  Therefore, SafeSport is aware this has been happening for some time and has chosen to stonewall and ignore it.

Request for Immediate Action:

-Expedite the investigation or lift the respondent’s suspension.

-Address the abuse of process and prevent further harm to the respondent.

-Review SafeSport’s policies to prevent foreign competitors from exploiting the system without proper jurisdictional oversight.

-Ensure that all allegations are reviewed fairly, without bias or external interference.

It is important to highlight that the legislation empowering SafeSport explicitly outlines that the center adhere to procedural due process and to evaluate cases based on the preponderance of evidence, consistent with the burden of proof in civil law. However, it appears that, in this and numerous other instances, the center is treating allegations as established facts and presuming guilt. The document linked above includes several studies that thoroughly examine the phenomenon of false allegations, with findings indicating a rate between 2% and 10%. These statistics underscore the vital importance of upholding due process—a cornerstone of democracy and the rule of law. History's darkest chapters serve as stark reminders that no end can ever justify circumventing this fundamental safeguard.

As several attempts from several members of the public regarding this troubling case have gone unaddressed, in the interests in matters of oversight and transparency, we are escalating record of this complaint to the U.S. Department of Justice, the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, and oversight bodies. Copies of this report will also be shared with legislators supporting the Title 36 bill and the U.S. Center for SafeSport Oversight Committee.  I made a complaint outlining this concerns several months ago, which was dismissed.

The U.S. Center for SafeSport was established to protect athletes and foster a safe environment. Allowing unproven allegations to cause harm undermines this mission and jeopardizes the integrity of the organization. I urge you to address this matter with the urgency it deserves and follow the rules as the bill clearly stipulates in public record: The preponderance of the evidence falling in line with standards in civil law and not a presumption of guilt or assuming that all allegations are truthful. There are several studies that are referenced in this document that state that false allegations are a real phenomenon between 2 - 10% of cases. In addition, please consider whether U.S. Centre for SafeSport should be receiving claims from adult foreign competitors if they cannot jurisdictionally control abuses of process, especially to the devastating magnitude that occurred in this case.

I have also provided the following links above regarding a review of what has occurred in the public document. This document has been downloaded 1370 times and has been passed on to house representatives, senator and members of the media. All of the above links are posted on social platforms.

Thank you for your time and attention to this critical issue.

Regards,

---------

**From: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 9:50 AM
To: ---------------Media Requests ------------ Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Subject: RE: ------Submission Receipt**

Good morning,

I wanted to confirm receipt of your email and let you know that it has been forwarded to our investigative team.

Take care,

-------------

|  |
| --- |
| **Text  Description automatically generated** |
| ------------------Process Navigator |
| **Image** |
| [***www.uscenterforsafesport.org***](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fuscenterforsafesport.org%2F&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577009188844%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=0CSpO4RMCoA2q7akpdts0sjIfMs90kfDTXTTOpABNr4%3D&reserved=0)

|  |
| --- |
|  Image  |
| **FOLLOW US** |
| **A black and orange logo  Description automatically generated  A black and orange logo  Description automatically generated  signature_2549169550  A logo of a camera  Description automatically generated** |

 |

**From: --------------------
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 2:32 PM
To: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Subject:Submission Receipt**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Good afternoon,

I appreciate your email confirmation.

I am wondering if you would be able to add one important detail that has been pointed out to me. The International Olympic Committee hands out condoms in the Olympic village. If relations between adult athletes is being policed, U.S. Centre for Safe Sport or a factor in suspension, this is incongruent with the IOC's condoning of this realistic behaviour in athletes.

Thank you for your consideration in forwarding this.

Best regards,

**From: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 4:18:10 PM
To: -----------; Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Subject: Submission Receipt**

Hi -------------

Consensual sexual relations are not within the purview of the US Center for SafeSport and are not considered misconduct. Making condoms available within the Olympic village for those who choose to engage in consensual sexual acts does not contradict with our mission. Sexual encounters only become SafeSport matters if there is misconduct, such as nonconsensual encounters or when a power imbalance exists. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

|  |
| --- |
| **Text  Description automatically generated with low confidence** |
| **------------------------****Manager of Process Education & Navigation** |
| **signature_3812787831** |
| [***www.uscenterforsafesport.org***](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fuscenterforsafesport.org%2F&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577009034984%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=zKgihIiU98zUkUSaD2%2BZ5AQvbjU6ySmOacTS1m2u48g%3D&reserved=0) Image  |
| **FOLLOW US** |
| **A black and orange logo  Description automatically generated  A black and orange logo  Description automatically generated  signature_2549169550  A logo of a camera  Description automatically generated** |

**From: --------------
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 4:29 PM
To: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Subject: Submission Receipt**

Hi -------------

Thank you for your prompt response and clarification. I’m relieved to understand that the Center’s policy does not involve policing or discouraging consensual private interactions between adult athletes in each other’s rooms. If I understand correctly, simply being in a room alone together is not in itself grounds to assume malfeasance. Is that accurate?

I would like to inquire about the criteria for suspending an athlete in cases where there are unverified allegations, especially in situations involving two adults with no power imbalance and he-said/she-said scenario. If the evidence has not been thoroughly examined, what factors would warrant a suspension under these circumstances?

Additionally, how do you view intoxication or unverified medication use in relation to a potential power imbalance? Do you consider gender to be a factor in determining power dynamics? It’s important to note that in settings like the Olympic Village, adult competitors (both male and female) often engage in celebratory behavior involving substances, and the IOC acknowledges this reality by providing condoms. Is it fair to surmise on my part then, that given the status of the IOC in world sports, that intoxication or gender alone would not be assumed to indicate a non-consensual encounter ?

So, would the testimony of a single individual be sufficient grounds for suspension in such cases?

In general, what factors would lead to the assumption of non-consensual behavior that justifies an athlete’s suspension? Specifically, in a case involving:

* One-sided testimony with no corroboration
* No minor involvement
* No power imbalance (e.g., no coach or supervisor)
* No prior history or pattern of abuse
* Unverified evidence - in this case the complainant has used a PR team to disseminate evidence on a global scale on all platforms and in foreign print media. Therefore, detailed information has been provided regarding this case when the public would ordinarily not be privy to know.

This is crucial information for the public, as athletes need clarity on the potential risks they face and the factors that guide such serious decisions. I’ve reviewed the Code of Ethics but have not been able to pinpoint specific guidelines addressing this type of situation. Could there be recent revisions that I may have missed? It seems to be unprecedented in a case-by-case analysis.

I appreciate your time and your follow-up answers to enhance public knowledge on how to mitigate the risk of a career-ending suspension. This is information athletes deserve to know ahead of time if it is not addressed with clarity in training modules.

Sincerely,

 ---------

**From: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Date: Friday, January 17, 2025 at 10:46 AM
To: ------------ Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Subject: Submission Receipt**

Hi---------

You are correct that two adults being alone in a room together is not prohibited. A minor and an adult alone in a room together would be a violation of our Minor Athlete Abuse Prevention Policies.

We do impose temporary measures, the most restrictive of which is a temporary suspension, as a safety precaution in a handful of our cases. This is dependent upon the severity of the allegations, the perceived risk to the sporting community, and the evidence collected to back up the allegations. We do not impose temporary measures until we have put a case through the Preliminary Inquiry stage, where we speak with claimants and gather readily available documentation. Any temporary measures also have to be approved by an Assistant Director and our Legal team. This is not a step we take lightly, as we understand that any restriction can have a profound impact on a person’s life and livelihood. As the case continues, and more details are collected, we are always reassessing what level of restriction is appropriate and modify temporary measures in accordance with the current perceived safety risk. Additionally, respondents have the option to arbitrate a temporary suspension to have a third party decide whether or not that particular type of temporary measure was appropriate.

Section VIII.F of the [SafeSport Code](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fuscenterforsafesport.org%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2023%2F03%2F2024_SafeSportCode-_073124_v3-A-.pdf&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577008799964%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=PXT3QlNGIMbwYer70q5c1g1m0y14Ue6OEamMYaPBs8g%3D&reserved=0) defines consent and Section VIII.M defines a power imbalance. Section IX lists all the types of prohibited behavior, which apply both to adults and minors. Section XII.2 describes the considerations when imposing temporary measures. Every case is different, and my team is not involved in the investigations, so we can only provide general process information. We cannot apply that to any particular case. Additionally, we cannot discuss any particular case with those who are not a party to the case (respondent, claimant(s), and their appointed advisors).

Our annual mandatory training modules for adults cover the basic information that everyone needs to keep top of mind as they participate in the US Olympic and Paralympic Movement. However, all Participants/members are responsible for knowing the SafeSport Code, which goes into more details about prohibited conducts and the process for investigating allegations reported to the Center. We also have supplemental trainings and educational materials on our website.

I understand you have a strong perspective about what has happened/is happening in this case. I know it’s difficult to care greatly,but not be able to get all the answers you seek due to confidentiality policies. Please let me know if you have any additional general process questions we can answer for you.

Best,

|  |
| --- |
| **Text  Description automatically generated with low confidence** |
| ----------------**Manager of Process Education & Navigation** |
| **signature_3812787831** |
| [***www.uscenterforsafesport.org***](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fuscenterforsafesport.org%2F&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577008829522%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=sdMfEqK2FtCcYeoQkokRYZVi2EcxhdVwVx4P77ziKHU%3D&reserved=0) Image  |
| **FOLLOW US** |
| **A black and orange logo  Description automatically generated  A black and orange logo  Description automatically generated  signature_2549169550  A logo of a camera  Description automatically generated** |
|  |



**From: -------------
Sent: Friday, January 17, 2025 11:43 AM
To: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Subject:  Submission Receipt**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Hi -----------

Thank you for taking the time to address my questions and to your dedication in addressing issues of abuse and ensuring the safety of all athletes. As a parent and team manager of two boys in minor hockey and a third who plays in the United States Hockey League, it is safe and reasonable to tell you that there is generalized growing concern about the risk to our athletes in the face of potential malicious allegations if procedural due process is not followed.  It’s tough to make an argument that this hasn’t occurred in the case of Mr. Desyatov, given how his case has played out in the court of public opinion prior to the investigation.  In addition, you have foreign allegations coming in against our US athletes in which you can’t jurisdictionally address an abuse of power by a complainant. Do you see the danger in that being a motivating factor for a competing country to engage in potential cheating and corruption in the absence of a pre-determinate hearing and examination of evidence before suspension?

Thank you for providing the specific reference points in the Code of Ethics as to what would fall under misconduct prior to a thorough examination.  Respectfully, these are broad definitions that would encompass most interactions in one form or another, particularly regarding power imbalances and non-consensual contact. These provisions appear to leave significant room for subjective interpretation, which could lead to unintended consequences. This underlines how important it is to take in critical context before a suspension of this magnitude.

The integrity of the case has already been severely compromised at this point due to wide publicization and foreign media engagement by the complainant and her influencer agent. This has invited public scrutiny due to the abuse of process therefore it is reasonable for US citizens to have concerns and questions regarding this specific case.

In this case, there appear to be several red flags that warrant scrutiny:

* **Inconsistencies in the Complainant’s Statements:** Publicly available information indicates alterations in timelines and other key details over several months.
* **Verified Evidence ?**: Assess the accuracy and authenticity of digital evidence, and consider external factors such as language barriers or potential manipulation.
* **Lack of Jurisdiction and Verifiable Investigation:** There have been verified reports that no police investigation has been initiated in France, and the matter remains a pre-complaint due to jurisdictional challenges.
* **Public Influence and Media Campaigns:** The complainant’s engagement with influencer agencies and media outlets has turned this matter into a trial by public opinion. This undermines the sanctity of proper investigative processes and invites speculation.
* **Critical Context/Whistleblowers:** Numerous skaters have come forward anonymously stating they have been encouraged to be silent about the complainant being extremely intoxicated that evening and that the respondent was helping her as they were former friends and roommates.  There was a large group in attendance. She was left alone in the room and no one was coming forward to stay with her so that she wouldn’t fall again, aspirate or go into respiratory depression due to alcohol intoxication and it is reported that the respondent was the only one who stepped up due to their pre-existing relationship. This is critical context.

Moreover, I understand that Mr. Desyatov has been suspended for over three months.  I’m assuming this hearing has taken place already.  This delay raises questions about procedural fairness and due process. Has Mr. Desyatov been given an opportunity to present evidence and context? Key considerations such as language barriers (he was reportedly a year into learning English) and the authenticity of digital evidence, including screenshots, must also be evaluated.

Taking into Mr. Desyatov’s case and also generally speaking, why would an athlete be considered dangerous to the sport and to vulnerable individuals if:

* No minor involvement
* One-time one-sided allegation without corroboration or hearing the other side
* No prior history
* No clear power imbalance (coach, supervisor)
* We could include unverified evidence in there as the complainant has ubiquitiously publicized this case in foreign print media and online. This integrity of the case has already been significantly compromised with all due respect.

If Mr. Desyatov is considered a danger to the sport given the factors above, then most of our young male athletes are at a significant risk to have their careers devastated. There is a major disconnect here that is not adding up the public.   I sincerely hope that the Center will be addressing this as this has all the signs of a significant miscarriage of justice.  In that case, the harms caused to a vulnerable orphaned athlete like Mr. Desyatov in going through the psychological abuse of online denigration and having liberty taken away from being suspended right before a pivotal stepping stone in his athletic career would be significant.  The denial or disregard of my above points in continuing to potentially harm this athlete through delays and not following due process in investigating critical context, would seem to constitute malice at this point. And I don’t say this lightly

Athletes and their families entrust governing bodies to uphold fairness, integrity, and justice. I trust that you will address these concerns with the seriousness they deserve. This is a major concern of parents of young men. While protecting athletes from abuse is paramount, it is equally important to prevent harm caused by unsubstantiated allegations and compromised due process.  I sympathize with a really difficult mission, however, what occurred here is wrong on every level. I would hope every effort would be made to make it right.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. I look forward to your response.

I have included several references to the document that has been widely publicized online and brought forward to many representatives in the US Congress.

Sincerely, -------------

[https://drive.proton.me/urls/NDWC5YA3NC#bBSdpTR8FfJK](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdrive.proton.me%2Furls%2FNDWC5YA3NC%23bBSdpTR8FfJK&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577008767365%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=mABY7681f0YltMrkthmZ918jnnUKWTODe2SOD2BSbCU%3D&reserved=0)

*A formalized process for investigating allegations was created as part of SafeSport's mandate under the****U.S. Centre for SafeSport Code of Ethics.****However,****significant concerns****have been raised about the****fairness and transparency of these processes in that the organization does not follow procedural due process.****Athletes accused of misconduct could be suspended and listed on a public database****without being heard ie. Pre-determination hearing foundational to due process****often****waiting months or years****for an investigation to conclude.*

*“In other words, “liberty” is implicated, and procedural due process is required when government actions threatens an employee’s good name, reputation, honor or integrity.” McNeil v Butz 480 F.2d,314, 319 (4th cir.1973. (Citing Bd. Of Regents v.Roth 408 U.S. 564 573, 92, S Ct. 2701, 33 L.Ed.2d 548 (1972) Wisconsin v. Constantineau, 400 UI.S. 433, 437, 91, S.Ct. 507, 27 L. Ed. 2d 515 (1971) Wieman V. Updergraff, 344 U.S. 183, 73, S. Ct 21597, L.Ed. 216 (1952)*

*In 2020,****a second amendment to the law emphasized the importance of procedural due process****. Despite this, SafeSport made minimal adjustments to its policies.  Crucially,****did NOT include - the right to be heard ie. Pre-determination hearing -prior to being declared ineligible to participate in their sport A.K.A Livelihood and Liberty in their process****. Critics argue that this violates the principles of procedural due process and****is in conflict with the Ted Stevens Act designed to protect amateur athletes.***

**From: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Date: Friday, January 17, 2025 at 1:51 PM
To: --------------, Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Subject: ----------- Submission Receipt**

Hi --------------

I can respond to a few of your questions/statements from a general process standpoint in order to provide more context regarding our process. As you know, we cannot address anything specific to this case.

Section XI.S of the SafeSport Code states that claimants and respondents are able to speak freely about their experiences, the investigation, and the outcome. People have free speech, and we do not restrict their ability to exercise it. If someone chooses to go to the media, that’s their decision, and they assume all risks that come with that.

Language barriers are considered, and both parties have ample opportunities in our process to explain what they meant or how they feel something was misinterpreted. We also contract with a company for translation and transcription services to ensure all voices are accurately heard.

In a formal investigation, we reach out to all relevant parties, including witnesses. We collect information from as many perspectives as possible. We are aware that humans may manipulate testimony or evidence. Our investigators have experience in the FBI, NCIS, SVUs, and Title IX investigations. They are experts in this field. In addition, each investigator has an Assistant Director and Director of Investigations that review every step in the case. Our Legal team also reviews every step. There is never one person making decisions, and we follow our internal SOPs consistently in each case.

When a respondent requests an arbitration to contest a temporary measure we have imposed on them, a third party arbitration organization takes over. Arbitrations are typically scheduled within 72 hours of the respondent filing their request with that organization, the arbitration itself takes less than a day to conduct, and the arbitrator issues their decision within 24 hours. These typically happen very quickly, both the respondent and the Center have ample opportunity to present their case, and it’s at the sole discretion of the arbitrator to uphold, modify, or remove our temporary measure. If a temporary measure is upheld, that is further confirmation that the Center’s measure is appropriate to protect the sporting community.

I also want to address your comment that the prohibited conduct outlined in the SafeSport Code are “broad definitions that would encompass most interactions in one form or another.” I respectfully push back on that statement. Athletes, coaches, board members, and other participants who interact with each other in appropriate ways that cause no harm are at miniscule to no risk of being found in violation. This makes me think of “boys will be boys,” which downplays inappropriate behavior, reinforces negative gender stereotypes, and excuses accountability for harming others. The SafeSport Code is applied to everyone equally, and the process is the same for everyone. While intentional false reporting does occasionally occur, it’s rare, and if we find it has occurred, we take action against the person who weaponized SafeSport in such a way. Our investigators are trained and experienced in assessing credibility, and since we have to meet a preponderance of the evidence in order to have a finding of a violation, false claims that have no evidence or witness corroboration are quickly closed with no negative repercussions to the respondent.

I understand that you feel you know what happened and that the Center is not handling this case in the way you feel it should be handled. Without being privy to confidential information or being a party to the investigation, it’s impossible to understand what information the Center has collected or why we make decisions we make. I know it’s difficult to watch someone you care about go through an investigative process and get negative press, and it’s commendable that you are fighting for that person.

Best,

|  |
| --- |
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| -------------------------**Manager of Process Education & Navigation** |
| **signature_3812787831** |
| [***www.uscenterforsafesport.org***](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fuscenterforsafesport.org%2F&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577008597861%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=5XhntT640PXmbyH%2F9L9yERd8jIlIK1TneUFkHH2rzsI%3D&reserved=0) Image |

**From: ---------------
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2025 11:17 AM
To: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Subject: Submission Receipt**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Hi again -------------

385 re-posts by complainant’s mother on X,  cyberbullying with labels and wishes of harm to  Ivan Desyatov since suspension.

[https://drive.proton.me/urls/7VERMQZ16C#8uXFegZwbmfo](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdrive.proton.me%2Furls%2F7VERMQZ16C%238uXFegZwbmfo&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577008534590%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=%2FjYceHc94L8L3zZb8ztt%2F8qMhQ%2BUr8DCOuPQxZOep5M%3D&reserved=0).

[https://www.instagram.com/reel/DEwLABDA0W8/?igsh=MTB1ZnFnNDUzdTd6bA](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.instagram.com%2Freel%2FDEwLABDA0W8%2F%3Figsh%3DMTB1ZnFnNDUzdTd6bA&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577008554327%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=J431l%2FriHatuVO%2BtWaeCxhy5dV6N9KXmOuH2Ym1S7gY%3D&reserved=0)==

Admitted on this same platform to acting on her behalf.

**Is this what you were referring to in dismissing public concern about global cyberbullying and relentless denigration as “free speech” and “ negative press" to a US athlete that falls under your purview to safeguard ? Update: I’ve been notified those tweets were deleted last week. The damage is already done and there is a 7-minute video of the close to defamatory posts.**

[https://vimeo.com/1038387386](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fvimeo.com%2F1038387386&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577008571175%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=LQGqia5AGQS%2FQtVt1YnnKuKD3bJqmtyimS2ahAcfsTo%3D&reserved=0)



Thank you for taking the time to explain this complex and challenging process to me. I understand it is likely tedious, but I hope you can recognize the gravity of having one’s liberty and livelihood stripped away without procedural due process being a matter of great public concern. The devastating effects of a defamatory campaign—built on the publicization of unproven allegations and unverified evidence, compounded by the weight of a SafeSport suspension—cannot be overstated.

Suspending an athlete from their profession and their participation in the sport for any length of time, —based solely on one-sided testimony and unverified, uncorroborated evidence from a foreign adult competitor of Team USA—and publicly listing the athlete on a database **does not constitute procedural due process.** These actions fall far short of any legal standard for fair process and the Center’s processes are confirmed to be escalated and challenged in federal court.

The citizens of the United States need to know, as it is in the interests of everyone in the US sporting community, what risk their amateur athletes face and what is being done under their noses.

That the private entity that is the U.S. Centre for SafeSport,

-The government whose judicial system is designed by the founding fathers to maintain the integrity of the Bill of Rights and U.S. Constitution

- granted the private entity that is SafeSport exclusive authority for SafeSport to safeguard US athletes and follow procedural due process

-The Centre decided on a work-around process instead and is misleading the public and the government into believing it’s a fair hearing following its mandate to provide procedural due process, when the hearing is only granted AFTER the suspension has been publicly handed down. What people don’t know is that the hearing operates- under your code - "THAT THE REBUTTAL PRESUMPTION IS THAT THE ALLEGATIONS, AS PRESENTED, ARE TRUE", and that the Center will not hear the testimony of the respondent that might be exculpatory to the case as to why you are not a danger to the sport. At a substantial cost to the respondent.

- I question why a respondent who has no prior history and no pattern of abuse, was accused by a former adult peer and competitor of a one-time event that involved two people in a he-said/she-said case with no verified evidence, was suspended -other then- perhaps the Centre was sent the article that had been drafted and wasn’t published yet and acted in haste. Condoning a foreign defamatory article against a US athlete, in light of unproven allegations that was mistranslated to English to allegedly mislead, and then further enabled it by issuing a no-contact directive the day prior to the publishing date. Which was widely tweeted by the complainant’s mother.

-This is reasonably perceived as malicious activity the Center appears to be complicit in.

In denying this, is seemingly cooperating with foreign public relations and media companies in destroying an amateur athlete’s life and livelihood and by inaction condoning cyberbullying and denigration, which you refer to as “free speech” and “negative press”

 Despite the fact, that there is a reasonable inference that could be made that the concerning actions the complainant took before and following the report to attack the respondent’s character publicly are highly suspicious to be malicious in intent and needed to be vetted expeditiously given the level of cyberbullying the Center had been made aware formerly for two months?   **Please explain, how any further inaction by the centre is not malicious in nature and how you intend to maintain any integrity left in the investigation by any legal standard at this point ?**

Would it be fair to say then, that US amateur athletes stand alone, outside of professional athletes, employees under Loudermill rights, athletes involved in anti-doping investigations and the US civilian population, in having the lowest rights on US soil ?

I respectfully request a clear response to these questions. Failure to address these concerns could reasonably be interpreted as tacit complicity in the actions described.

**Integrity of the Investigation**: Does the U.S. Center for SafeSport maintain that these actions uphold the integrity of an active investigation?  **What integrity can remain in an investigation when the athlete is publicly denigrated, judged, and effectively indicted in the court of public opinion prior to having his testimony and evidence heard ?**

**Abuse of Process Allegations**: Does the U.S. Center for SafeSport support or permit the complainant’s alleged actions that constitute Abuse of Process under Section IX, Code H.1.a, d, g, and m? Specifically, the complainant's translation of a French article into shared English screenshots—verified by her PR team—that misrepresent the original content, coupled with a French lawyer who has a conflict of interest due to their being a writer for the same publication.

**Position on Cyberbullying and Online Denigration During Investigation:** Are you asserting that it is the U.S. Center for SafeSport’s position to condone or enable actions by a foreign complainant and her team to incite harassment against a respondent during an active investigation? Particularly when the complainant's frequently publicized alterations to timelines strongly suggest signs of malice and a motive for harm?

**Position on potential foreign interference**working with the complainant’s foreign PR agency in allegedly reaching out to them to issue no-contact directive the day before a defamatory article from a foreign media outlet is published, condoning the defamatory paywalled French article and misleading translation of the article distributed online.

**Is Discrimination against the respondent’s Russian ethnicity a factor**? Was this a factor in the unprecedented suspension in that it was assumed that individuals wouldn’t advocate for his rights to be upheld? The respondent is a human being and can’t change where he was born and raised.

**Position on verifying claims:** How has the centre verified that the complainant was incapacitated? Individuals in a large group of skaters stated the witness was severely intoxicated and the respondent was left to care for her as she was left alone. Why was this left out of the narrativ ? What factor is the history of TBI as the status of generalized incapacitation if the complainant was able to compete in a highly difficult sport at an elite world level?

Three months later, the athlete remains suspended, his reputation damaged, and his opportunities in the sport likely destroyed—all while SafeSport ongoingly fails to maintain the integrity of the investigation or protect the safety and psychological well-being of a potentially wrongfully accused U.S. athlete. In a he-said/she-said allegation between colleagues with no concrete evidence.

This is not just a matter of a single athlete's rights but a broader indictment of a system that prioritizes optics over fairness. While safeguarding against abuse is a noble mission, it cannot come at the expense of fundamental principles of justice. Failing to provide respondents with a meaningful opportunity to defend themselves before public condemnation is both unethical and unconstitutional

Moreover, the Centre’s unwillingness to acknowledge the harm caused by defamation campaigns enabled by its own flawed processes is deeply troubling. By allowing baseless accusations to fester unchecked and failing to ensure timely resolutions, the Centre is complicit in perpetuating a toxic environment that fosters character assassination rather than constructive conflict resolution.

In its current state, the Center's actions—or lack thereof—betray the very values it purports to uphold. It is not enough to merely safeguard athletes from abuse; the system must also protect the rights of those accused to ensure that justice is truly served. Anything less is a betrayal of the athletes, the community, and the principles of fairness that should be at the core of every decision made.

***Given the unquestionable severe compromise to any investigation the Center plans to move forward on, and the harassing and malicious, seemingly strategical  behaviour of the foreign complainant  and her PR team that has gone unchecked- It is the Center’s responsibility to admit likely failings and complicity in potential wrongdoing in this case, process the investigation expeditiously and fairly and take a learned lesson approach moving forward before this escalates any further. A potentially innocent athlete has already suffered enough mental health and reputational damage and should have at least some of his rights salvaged by doing so. Continuing to be complicit in his harm by action or inaction is directly contradictory to the Center’s purpose it was granted authority for.***

Thank you for your time and consideration to this very serious matter of public concern. Parents, parents of athletes, and those involved in the sporting community need to know what grave risks they face from one unverified allegation from a peer.

Sincerely,

----------------

|  |
| --- |
| **FOLLOW US** |
| **A black and orange logo  Description automatically generated  A black and orange logo  Description automatically generated  signature_2549169550  A logo of a camera  Description automatically generated** |
|  |

**From: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Date: Tuesday, January 21, 2025 at 10:09 AM
To: -------------- Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Subject: RE: --------------Submission Receipt**

Hi ------------

I received both of your emails and have passed them along to our investigative team for review.

Best,

|  |
| --- |
| **Text  Description automatically generated with low confidence** |
| -------------------**Manager of Process Education & Navigation** |
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**From: ------------------
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2025 10:19 AM
To: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Subject: ------------**

Good morning ----------------

Thank you for your email and for taking the time to address this matter.

After reviewing publicly available information from the past two months, I respectfully request that the Center reconsider and lift Ivan Desyatov’s suspension while proceeding with an investigation, as significant delays can also constitute a denial of procedural due process based on US concepts of the rule of law.  The circumstances surrounding the allegation, the lack of verified and corroborated testimony or evidence, and the unprecedented nature of the suspension raise concerns about the fairness and future of this investigation.  Further delays only exacerbate this issue.

The complainant has shared varied and inconsistent timelines in the public domain, reportedly with assistance from a PR team. This appears to be a one-time allegation involving an adult peer with whom Ivan previously had a close relationship. It is reasonable to consider that his presence in her room may have been an effort to ensure her safety during a state of alleged severe intoxication, especially given emerging speculation that no one else was willing to do so. The respondent is a vulnerable newcomer without immediate family support due to the death of his parents in his teenage years, and there are indications he may be subject to discrimination and manipulation.

Given these factors, it is difficult to see justification for the ongoing suspension. Additionally, I urge the Center to expedite its investigation given the significant impact this situation has had on Ivan’s mental health, career, and competitive opportunities. Since October, a potentially innocent athlete has been unable to train or participate in his sport with his ice dance partner, further exacerbating the harm caused by the suspension.

I understand that SafeSport is still in its early stages, and I trust that the team will adopt a learning approach, drawing from various circumstances, given the Center's significant influence within the sporting community. At this point, I believe Mr. Desyatov would simply be grateful for the opportunity to train in the sport he has dedicated his entire life to, which is also his primary source of funding and his livelihood, and to be afforded the due process that everyone deserves.

This case raises broader concerns about the potential vulnerability of amateur athletes across the United States. If an individual can be suspended under such circumstances, it could set a precedent that places all amateur athletes at risk of career-damaging allegations without due process. This is an issue of public interest that deserves careful consideration.

I kindly request a follow-up regarding the positions outlined in this email. The amateur sporting community and the public have a right to understand the risks to their livelihoods and the procedures in place to protect them.

Thank you for your time and attention to this serious matter. I look forward to your response.

Best regards,

-----------------

**From: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2025 12:05:59 PM
To: ------------ Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>
Subject: ------------**

Hi -----------------

I appreciate your heart for advocating. As you know, we cannot discuss a specific case with anyone who is not a party to that case. As you are not a party to this case, we cannot respond to your positions as they relate to a particular case. We have provided general process information to you, and that’s as far as our communications with you can go at this time.

Best,

|  |
| --- |
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| ----------------------[***www.uscenterforsafesport.org***](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fuscenterforsafesport.org%2F&data=05%7C02%7C%7C7b1a27463faf4083f4dd08dd3afc1fd0%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638731577008247398%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=eqw7%2BVRG08WKX2Lu3dTA6M9OA%2FRS3JxjX8kmkeN%2BK9I%3D&reserved=0) Image  |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

  Hi again ----------- I sent an email reply just now and it did not go through and/or it seemed to get blocked. That is indeed strange.  Thank you for your email and sentiment. The position statements I requested are indeed general process inquiries and a matter of public interest and concern. I reiterate that the public and sporting community needs to know what risks they face based on the abuse of process and level of harassment that has played out in the public domain. What is the Center’s position on cyberbullying based on abuse of process from foreign complainants? How does the Center plan on safeguarding US athletes in this regard?  Thank you understanding the serious matter and gravity of this situation, in providing the public this vital information of potential dire consequence to our athletes?  Best regards, **From: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>Date: Tuesday, January 21, 2025 at 2:39 PMTo: --------------, Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>Subject: Submission Receipt**Hi ----------- I did receive both emails, but thanks for emailing the second time to be sure I got your email. Technology sure does funny things sometimes.  There is no difference in our process for those inside or outside the US. Our authority is over members/participants of the US Olympic and Paralympic Movement (USOPM), and anyone who is a part of the USOPM is under our authority to be investigated. It does not matter whether someone inside or outside the US submits a report to us – we respond to all reports in a consistent manner, and there has to be enough basis in order to move a case forward and even more basis in order to impose a temporary measure/sanction. While we can only investigate those who are a part of the USOPM, those who are not a part of the USOPM can participate as reporting parties, claimants, and witnesses in our process.  Cyberbullying (Section IX.D.3) and Abuse of Process (IX.H) have specific definitions under the SafeSport Code and are prohibited by members/participants of the USOPM. If we receive a report that a member/participant has engaged in these behaviors, we investigate. If such behavior is not under our authority, the person experiencing the misconduct can submit police reports if the behavior reaches a criminal level and/or consult with an attorney regarding their civil options.  Best,

|  |
| --- |
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| **FOLLOW US** |
| **A black and orange logo  Description automatically generated  A black and orange logo  Description automatically generated  signature_2549169550  A logo of a camera  Description automatically generated** |

**From: --------------- Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2025 5:19 PMTo: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>;---------- Subject:-------------------------**  Hi -------- Thanks I’m glad to hear that. Yes, it does happen sometimes. Thank you for elaborating on your processes.  You said “there is no difference in our process for those inside or outside the us”  with your mandate being to safeguard the amateur sporting community in the USA. I’ll take that point. If your process does not differ between handling complaints inside or outside the U.S., and your duty is to safeguard the amateur sporting community within the U.S., would it be fair to say that U.S. Centre for SafeSport’s **process harms U.S. athletes**in its failings  to protect them from abuse of process, the incitement of harassment and very reasonably the integrity of the investigation ?  **Cyberbullying (Section IX.D.3) and Abuse of Process (IX.H) have specific definitions under the SafeSport Code and are prohibited by members/participants of the USOPM.****As below:** IMG_3328.jpgIMG_3526.jpeg IMG_3524.jpegThe U.S. Center for SafeSport, mandated to protect all U.S. athletes from all forms of abuse, denies accused athletes a pre-determination hearing before imposing suspension. This practice leaves potentially innocent athletes vulnerable to abuse of process, particularly in cases involving foreign complainants, where the Center has acknowledged its inability to act due to lack of jurisdiction.With a false allegation risk of 2–10%, coupled with the Center’s inability to guarantee that abuses of process will be addressed in foreign cases—especially when minors are not involved and the standard of evidence is low—does the Center not bear the responsibility to verify the evidence before imposing suspension, given the substantial risk this places on the accused? Such oversight undermines the integrity of investigations and leaves athletes exposed to undue harm. Does this not amount to an abdication of responsibility and a contradiction of the Center’s mission?The public is understandably concerned by a process that exposes athletes to harm from unverified allegations and procedural flaws. Accepting foreign complaints without ensuring procedural due process undermines the rights of U.S. athletes and the integrity of the system. In denying due process, in contradiction to the Ted Stevens Act and its 2020 amendment granting the Center its operational authority, it is reasonable to conclude that SafeSport—whether investigating a complaint inside the U.S. or, especially, outside of it—**effectively throws respondents to the wolves and absolves itself of responsibility.**Meanwhile, the Center continues to present claims to the public that it upholds investigative soundness, ethical standards, and procedural fairness. How do you resolve this?Does the Center view it as acceptable to subject athletes to these vulnerabilities, particularly when complaints lack critical factors? If so, how does this align with the Center’s mission to safeguard all U.S. athletes from all forms of abuse? Safeguarding athletes against abuse and ensuring full procedural due process for U.S. respondents—the protections granted to professional athletes and those accused of doping violations—should not be mutually exclusive. Where is the accountability for the harm caused by the Center’s processes?Thank you for your serious consideration of this matter and for forwarding Ivan Desyatov’s case to the investigative team. With all due respect to the noble mission of the Center, given the points raised above and the apparent lack of accountability and acknowledgment of the harms caused—harms which run counter to its mission—I am uncertain how the Center can claim any integrity remains in its handling of this case.I hope that every effort will be made to restore it expeditiously in good faith, as ultimately, I want the Center to succeed in its mission to safeguard ALL athletes as parties involved in an investigation by upholding their rights and ensuring a "do no further harm" approach through its process. The ends do not justify compromising the means by failing to uphold these essential principles, as doing so will only continue to undermine the Center's mission. Sincerely,  **From: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>Date: Wednesday, January 22, 2025 at 9:48 AMTo: --------------------- Cc: Process Navigators <****process.navigators@safesport.org****>------------------ Subject: RE: --------------Submission Receipt**Good morning---------A temporary measure is a safety precaution while an investigation is ongoing. A temporary leave from duties/activities is a standard response to serious allegations of misconduct across many industries to allow time to properly assess the allegations and the supporting evidence while mitigating risk of harm. Please refer back to our email exchange on 1/17 for further description of our process for imposing a temporary measure.  Best,
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**Final Email January 22, 25**

I acknowledge your assertion that temporary measures are implemented as safety precautions during investigations. While this messaging may resonate with the public, it misrepresents critical facts and glosses over significant procedural shortcomings. The public's support is rooted in a genuine desire to protect athletes and minors from abuse. However, the Center’s lack of transparency and misrepresentation of its processes is deeply troubling and unacceptable.

A temporary measure or leave is **not** a standard response to serious allegations **prior**to allowing a respondent **to be heard** , as it violates the right to a Loudermill hearing and union protections under employment law. The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments prohibit depriving any individual of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Loudermill hearings are specifically designed to allow public employees to present their side BEFORE any disciplinary action is imposed. This fundamental right applies to all professions that involve vulnerable populations, such as teachers, law enforcement and nurses, who operate under the public trust.

Amateur athletes are uniquely disadvantaged, as they are the only group denied a pre-disciplinary hearing—a right afforded even to professional athletes and those accused of doping violation. The public is likely unaware of this issue until they personally face allegations, yet they deserve to understand the vulnerabilities amateur athletes endure

The Center’s claim to provide procedural due process is not only false but egregiously so. Congress, through the 2020 bill amendment *S. 2330* under the *The Amateur Sports Act*, clearly intended in writing for respondents to be afforded due process, yet your processes fail to uphold this standard. Instead, your procedures presume guilt. Public suspensions inflict irreversible harm—damaging reputations and livelihoods—before respondents have any opportunity to defend themselves. Furthermore, post-suspension hearings at the athlete’s cost fail to address the investigation comprehensively, as your own code explicitly excludes testimony from respondents. This blatant denial of due process undermines the fundamental principles of fairness and justice foundational to the United States. **How is this attempt to create a work-around process and gaslight the American public on inquiry acceptable** ?

 The public is likely unaware of this issue until they personally face allegations, yet they deserve to understand the vulnerabilities amateur athletes endure. Their rights are often disregarded under the pretense of enforcing "safety measures," **despite the fact that true safety and procedural due process are not mutually exclusive and can coexist.** The continued **denial of this right**is indefensible and invites legal and ethical challenges that cannot be ignored.

The case of Ivan Desyatov exemplifies these systemic failures. With no prior history, no pattern of abuse, and no verifiable evidence beyond a one-sided account prior to being heard or investigated, his suspension lacks justification by any standard if the respondent is not allowed to be heard and/or provide potential exculpatory evidence The public is right to question whether a mistranslated French article—misleadingly stating an ongoing police investigation when the original article simply stated that a complaint was filed, without the ability to investigate—was used as evidence. The article was published by a media outlet that the complainant’s lawyer is a paid contributor to, further compounding the appearance of impropriety. This raises a deeply concerning question: **Does the Center accept unverified media articles as grounds for imposing unprecedented suspensions? Is this simply about optics ? If so, how is this not tantamount to foreign interference? If true, this is indicative of a profound breach of ethical standards. How does this square with the mission objective of SafeSport and its commitment to safety ?**

The repeated failure to transparently address these general process concerns and reasonable questions through multiple emails demonstrates a troubling lack of accountability. Procedural gaps, delays, and a refusal to engage my questions with comprehensive honesty are reasonably perceived to reflect negligence and efforts to mislead the public. The Center must take immediate steps to rectify the harm caused, expedite the investigation, and provide assurances to the public that it is committed to fairness and integrity.

What has happened to Ivan Desyatov could happen to any of our athletes, and that is nothing short of outrageous. The Center has a fundamental duty to uphold its mission, which includes safeguarding the rights of both respondents and complainants—particularly when investigating foreign complaints. To absolve the Center of any accountability for the harm caused by failing to preserve the integrity of the investigation, coupled with not taking responsibility to address multiple incidents of abuse of process and harassment - or even taking steps to expedite the investigation in lieu of it- despite being made formerly aware for the last two months, is completely unacceptable. Continuing to stonewall these concerns while neglecting your responsibility to a potentially innocent athlete under your purview is not just negligent; it is unconscionable.

With great power comes great responsibility. A transparent examination of shortcomings or procedural gaps in unprecedented cases presents a vital opportunity to improve the process, ensuring it upholds due process, fairness, and justice. while preserving the integrity of the Center.

**The Center must act swiftly to address and rectify the harm caused to a potentially innocent Team USA athlete by allowing him to endure reputational damage and psychological harm through harassment. By failing to uphold the integrity of the investigation and permitting an abuse of process to continue for two months despite being aware of it, the Center has fallen short of its responsibility. The public deserves clear assurances that moving forward, the Center is committed to fairness, integrity, and transparency in all its actions.  Anything less would be a betrayal of your mission and a disservice to those you claim to protect.**

Sincerely, -------------
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