
DECISION OF THE ATHLETICS INTEGRITY UNIT IN THE CASE OF MS SANDEEP KUMARI

Introduction

1. In April 2017, World Athletics (formerly the IAAF) established the Athletics Integrity Unit ("**AIU**") whose role is to protect the integrity of the sport of Athletics, including fulfilling the World Athletics' obligations as a Signatory to the World Anti-Doping Code. World Athletics has delegated implementation of the World Athletics 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 Sandeep KUMARI is a 27-year old Indian discus thrower who is an International-Level Athlete for the purposes of the ADR (the "**Athlete**").
3. This decision is issued by the AIU pursuant to Article 8.4.7 ADR which provides as follows:

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 (or is deemed to have done so), 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 26 June 2018, the Athlete was subject to in-competition Testing at the '58th National Inter-State Senior Athletics Championships', held in Guwahati, India, pursuant to the Testing Authority of the National Anti-Doping Agency of India ("**NADA**"). The Athlete provided a urine sample numbered 6174212 (the "**Sample**").
5. On 4 November 2018, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited laboratory in Montreal, Canada, reported an Adverse Analytical Finding for the presence of Metenolone in the Sample (the "**AAF**").
6. Metenolone is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2018 Prohibited List (S1: Anabolic Agents). It is a non-Specified Substance and is prohibited at all times. The Athlete did not have a TUE permitting the use of Metenolone.
7. WADA referred results management for the matter to the AIU in accordance with Article 7.1.1 of the World Anti-Doping Code¹ and the AIU assumed results management responsibility for the matter in accordance with Article 7.2.8(b) ADR.

¹ 7.1.1 "[...] Results management and the conduct of hearings for a test conducted by WADA on its own initiative, or an Anti-Doping Rule Violation discovered by WADA, will be conducted by the Anti-Doping Organization designated by WADA. [...]"

8. On 21 November 2018, the AIU notified the Athlete of the AAF and imposed a Provisional Suspension pending resolution of the case. The Athlete was requested to provide an explanation for the presence of Metenolone in the Sample and was afforded the opportunity to request analysis of the B Sample.
9. On 28 November 2018, the Athlete informed the AIU that she admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and waived her right to have the B Sample analyzed.
10. On 6 February 2019, the Athlete participated in an interview with representatives of the Integrity Unit by phone during which she confirmed that she admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations.
11. On 24 February 2020, the AIU issued a Notice of Charge to the Athlete for 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) (“the **Charge**”). The Athlete was offered the opportunity to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accept a four (4) year period of ineligibility, or to request a hearing before the Disciplinary Tribunal, by no later than 5 March 2020.
12. The Athlete did not reply to the AIU Notice of Charge within the given deadline.
13. On 9 March 2020, the AIU wrote to the athlete to grant her an extension until 13 March 2020 to provide a reply to the Charge.
14. The Athlete did not reply to the AIU Notice of Charge within the given deadline, but on 16 March 2020, requested a 3-week extension to provide her reply which was granted by the AIU.
15. The Athlete did not reply to the AIU Notice of Charge by the extended deadline of 3 April 2020.
16. On 14 April 2020, the Athlete was given a final opportunity to respond to the Notice of Charge and advised that, if she did not do so by 17 April 2020, 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.
17. On 20 April 2020, the Athlete informed the AIU that she accepted the Charge, did not request a hearing and accepted the Consequences proposed by the AIU.

Consequences

18. Together, the Anti-Doping Rule Violations pursuant to Article 2.1 ADR and Article 2.2 ADR constitute the Athlete’s first Anti-Doping Rule Violation under the ADR.
19. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted to committing Anti-Doping Rule Violations 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:
 - 11.1 a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years commencing on 26 June 2018 pursuant to Articles 10.2.1(a) ADR and Article 10.10.2(c) ADR²; and
 - 11.2. disqualification of the Athlete’s results at the ‘58th National Inter-State Senior Athletics Championships’ and from 26 June 2018 until 21 November 2018 with all resulting

² In accordance with article 10.10.2(c) ADR, the period of Ineligibility is backdated to the date of the Anti-Doping Rule Violation since there have been substantial delays in the hearing process and other aspects of Doping Control not attributable to the Athlete or other Person,

consequences including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points and prize and appearance money pursuant to Articles 9 and 10.8 ADR.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

22. Further to Article 13.2.4 ADR, WADA and 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 13.7.2 ADR.
23. 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, 24 April 2020