EXHIBIT 9

PATTON BOGGS LLP

2550 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037-1350
202-457-6000

Facsimile 202-457-6315
www.pattonboggs.com

June 24, 2012

VIA EMAIL AND TELEFACSIMILE

William Bock, III
General Counsel
United States Anti-Doping Agency
5555 Tech Center Drive
Suite 200
Colorado Springs, CO 80919

Dear Bill:

As you know, we have repeatedly requested that USADA share with us the evidence that allegedly supports the proposed charges against Lance Armstrong, and we have requested assurances that we have been provided with any information or evidence that USADA has shared with the Review Board. *See* Protocol § 11.c.ii (requiring information that USADA shares with the Review Board to be "provided simultaneously to the Athlete . . . and the Athlete . . . shall be entitled to file a response with the Review Board."). You have flatly refused to share any information underlying the proposed charges other than certain blood data from 2009-2010 (and, simultaneously, refused to provide us with any analysis or expert review that supports the insinuation that the data is consistent with improper conduct by Mr. Armstrong). However, you have been less than forthright in clarifying whether USADA has shared with us all information that it has provided to the Board. Any such *ex parte* submission would violate the Protocol, be grotesquely unfair, contravene accepted notions of due process, and sabotage any meaningful review by the Board.

On June 23, 2012, Travis Tygart, USADA's CEO, was quoted in *Cycling News* as follows: "USADA's CEO Travis Tygart stated that information has been submitted for review to the Anti-Doping Review Board (ADRB), 'and the ADRB will consider all submissions in accordance with the rules.'" *Cycling News*, June 23, 2012 ("Armstrong Attorneys Respond to USADA Charges."). We are naturally skeptical that any news account accurately reflects USADA's intentions. However, bitter experience makes us even more skeptical of USADA's conduct.

Accordingly, please confirm immediately whether or not USADA has provided the Anti-Doping Review Board with any information or evidence of any kind, whether orally or in writing, other than the proposed charges furnished to us on June 12, 2012. If so, we demand that this information be provided to us promptly and that we be given sufficient

time to address any such material before the Review Board deliberates. In addition, because USADA has chosen to describe its charges as a conspiracy and has named multiple respondents, if any other respondent has provided the Review Board with any information that USADA or the Review Board believe constitutes evidence relevant to the charges against Lance Armstrong, we also demand that this information be provided to us promptly and that we be given sufficient time to address any such material before the Review Board deliberates.

Yours sincerely,

Robert D. Luskin