

## DECISION OF THE ATHLETICS INTEGRITY UNIT IN THE CASE OF MS KIRANJIT KAUR

---

### 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 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 Karanjit Kaur is a 32-year old Indian long-distance runner 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 15 December 2019, the Athlete was subject to in-competition Testing at the 'Tata Steel Kolkata 25K' held in Kolkata, India, pursuant to the Testing Authority of the National Anti-Doping Agency of India ("**NADA**"). The Athlete provided two urine samples numbered A6363818 and 6363826 (the "**Samples**").
5. On 17 February 2020, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited laboratory in Doha reported an Adverse Analytical Finding of Enobosarm and its metabolite in the Samples (the "**AAFs**").
6. Enobosarm is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2019 Prohibited List (S1.2: Other 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 Enobosarm.
7. On 26 February 2020, the AIU notified the Athlete and imposed a Provisional Suspension pending resolution of the case. The Athlete was requested to provide an explanation for the presence of Enobosarm in the Samples by 4 March 2020 and was afforded the opportunity to request analysis of the B Sample.
8. On 12 March 2020, the Athlete provided an explanation to the AIU. The Athlete stated that she had been suffering with typhoid and took medication given to her by a village doctor, but did not

know the contents of the medication. She also asserted that she had developed a sudden pain in her breast and had been given additional medication to treat that pain.

9. The Athlete also waived her right to have the B Sample analysed.
10. After careful review, the AIU concluded that the Athlete's explanation was insufficient to explain the presence Enobasarm and its metabolite in the Samples.
11. On 23 March 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 30 March 2020.
12. On 30 March 2020, the Athlete acknowledged receipt of the Notice of Charge but did not reply substantively in relation to the presence of Enobasarm and its metabolites in the Samples or in relation to the Anti-Doping Rule Violations alleged against her.
13. On 2 April 2020, the AIU afforded the Athlete until 9 April 2020 to provide an explanation and to confirm how she wanted to proceed with the Notice of Charge.
14. The Athlete failed to reply to the Notice of Charge by 9 April 2020.
15. On 15 April 2020, the AIU afforded the Athlete a further period until 22 April 2020 to provide an explanation and to confirm how she wanted to proceed with the Notice of Charge.
16. The Athlete failed to provide an explanation of to confirm how she wanted to proceed with the Notice of Charge by 22 April 2020.
17. Therefore, on 27 April 2020, the AIU provided the Athlete with a final deadline to respond to the Notice of Charge by no later than 1 May 2020, failing which she would be deemed to have accepted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences set out in the Notice of Charge.
18. On 30 April 2020, the Athlete confirmed that she admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences proposed by the AIU (including a period of ineligibility of four (4) years) by returning a signed Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form.

## Consequences

19. 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.
20. 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:
  - a. a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years commencing on 15 December 2019 pursuant to Articles 10.2.1(a) ADR and Article 10.10.2(b) ADR; and
  - b. Disqualification of all competitive results obtained by the Athlete between 15 December 2019 and 26 February 2020 with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points prizes and appearance money pursuant to Article 9 ADR and Article 10.8 ADR.

### **Publication**

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

### **Rights of Appeal**

23. 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 ADR.
24. 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, 27 May 2020**