

---

## DECISION OF THE ATHLETICS INTEGRITY UNIT IN THE CASE OF MS SHEORAN NIRLMA

---

### Introduction

1. In April 2017, the IAAF established the Athletics Integrity Unit ("**AIU**") whose role is to protect the integrity of the sport of Athletics, including fulfilling the IAAF's obligations as a Signatory to the World Anti-Doping Code. The IAAF has delegated implementation of the IAAF Anti-Doping Rules ("**ADR**") to the AIU, including but not limited to the following activities in relation to International-Level Athletes: Testing, Investigations, Results Management, Hearings, Sanctions and Appeals.
2. Ms. Sheoran Nirmla is a 24-year old Indian sprinter who is an International-Level Athlete for the purposes of the ADR (the "**Athlete**").
3. This decision is accordingly issued pursuant to Article 8.4.7 ADR which provides that:

*8.4.7 "[i]n the event that [...] the Athlete or Athlete Support Person admits the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) charged and accedes to the Consequences specified by the Integrity Unit [...], a hearing before the Disciplinary Tribunal shall not be required. In such a case, the Integrity Unit [...] shall promptly issue a decision confirming [...] the commission of the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) and the imposition of the Specified Consequences [...]"*

### The Athlete's commission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations

4. On 29 June 2018, the Athlete underwent an in-competition doping control at the '58th National Inter-State Senior Athletics Championships' held in Guwahati, India. The Athlete provided a urine sample numbered 502103 (the "**Sample**").
5. On 28 October 2018, the Montreal laboratory reported an Adverse Analytical Finding (the "**AAF**") for the presence of Drostanolone and Metenolone in the Sample.
6. Drostanolone and Metenolone are Prohibited Substances under the WADA 2018 Prohibited List (S1: Anabolic Agents). They are non-Specified Substances and prohibited at all times. The Athlete did not have a TUE permitting the use of Drostanolone or Metenolone.
7. On 21 November 2018, the AIU notified the Athlete of the AAF and imposed a provisional suspension pending resolution of her case. The Athlete was requested to provide an explanation for the presence of Drostanolone and Metenolone in the Sample and was afforded the opportunity to request analysis of the B Sample.
8. On 28 November 2018, the Athlete informed the AIU that she admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violation and waived her right to have the B Sample analyzed.
9. On 31 January 2019, the IAAF Athlete Passport Management Unit ("**APMU**") informed the AIU that an Adverse Passport Finding ("the **APF**") was declared against the Athlete in accordance with Article 8.10(e) of the IAAF Anti-Doping Regulations (the "**Regulations**") as the Expert Panel had concluded

unanimously that it was highly likely that a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method had been used and highly unlikely that her Athlete Biological Passport (“**ABP**”) between 7 August 2013 and 2 August 2017 was the result of any other cause.

10. On 19 February 2019, the AIU notified the Athlete of the APF and asked her to provide an explanation for the abnormal variations in her ABP.
11. On 20 March 2019, the AIU received an explanation for the APF. Following review of that explanation, on 26 March 2019, the AIU informed the Athlete that the explanation pertained to matters related to the AAF rather than the APF. The athlete was granted an extension until 29 March 2019 to provide an explanation for the APF.
12. At her request, the Athlete was subsequently granted several extensions to provide her explanation for the APF.
13. On 18 July 2019, the Athlete was given a final deadline to submit her explanation for the APF by 22 July 2019. The AIU informed the Athlete that, if no explanation for the APF was provided by that deadline, then the explanation for the APF that was provided to the AIU on 20 March 2019 would be sent to the Expert Panel for review.
14. The Athlete failed to provide any further explanation for the APF by the given deadline and so the Athlete’s explanation for the APF received on 20 March 2019 was forwarded for review by the Expert Panel on 1 August 2019.
15. On 12 August 2019, the Expert Panel maintained its unanimous opinion that it was highly likely that a prohibited substance or prohibited method had been used and highly unlikely that the ABP profile abnormal was the result of any other cause.
16. On 2 September 2019, the AIU charged the Athlete with committing Anti-Doping Rule Violations pursuant to Article 2.1 ADR (Presence of a Prohibited Substance) and Article 2.2 ADR (Use of a Prohibited Substance) in relation to the AAF and the APF. The Athlete was offered the opportunity to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accept a four (4) year sanction, or request a hearing before the Disciplinary Tribunal, by no later than 12 September 2019.
17. The Athlete did not reply to the AIU Notice of Charge within the given deadline.
18. On 13 September 2019, the Athlete was given a final opportunity to respond to the Notice of Charge and advised that, if she did not do so by 18 September 2019, she would be deemed to have waived her right to a hearing before the Disciplinary Tribunal, to have admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and to have accepted the Consequences for those Anti-Doping Rule Violations specified in the Notice of Charge.
19. On 19 September 2019, the Athlete informed the AIU that she accepted the Charge, did not request a hearing and was ready to accept the Consequences proposed by the AIU.

### **Consequences**

20. The AAF and the APF are considered as one violation in accordance with Article 10.7.4 ADR and, together, they constitute the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation under the ADR.
21. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted to committing an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Article 2.1 ADR and Article 2.2 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:

- 21.1 a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years pursuant to Article 10.2.1(a) commencing on 29 June 2018 in accordance with Article ADR 10.10.2(b); and
- 21.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results from 15 August 2016 to 21 November 2018 with all resulting consequences including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points and prize and appearance money pursuant to Articles 9 and 10.8 ADR.
22. The Athlete has accepted the above Consequences for her Anti-Doping Rule Violation and has expressly waived her right to have those Consequences determined by the Disciplinary Tribunal at a hearing.

### **Publication**

23. In accordance with Article 8.4.7(b) ADR, the AIU shall publicly report this decision on the AIU's website.
24. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Article 8.4.7 ADR.

### **Rights of Appeal**

25. Further to Article 13.2.4 ADR, the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) and the Indian National Anti-Doping Agency (NADA) have a right of appeal against this decision to the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne, Switzerland, in accordance with the procedure set out at Article 13.7 ADR.
26. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or NADA, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise her right of cross-appeal in accordance with Article 13.9.3 ADR.

**Monaco, 7 October 2019**