Athletics Integrity Unit

1st Floor
6 Quai Antoine 1er
MC 98007, Monaco

Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Archana Laxman Jadhav

Introduction

1. World Athletics has 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 ('the "**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 Archana Laxman Jadhav ("the **Athlete**") is a 20-year-old long-distance runner from India[1].

3. This decision is issued by the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR, which provides as follows:

> *"8.5.6 In the event that the Athlete or other Person either (i) admits the violation and accepts the proposed Consequences or (ii) is deemed to have admitted the violation and accepted the Consequences as per Rule 8.5.2(f), the Integrity Unit will promptly:*
>
> *(a) issue a decision confirming the commission of the violation(s) and the imposition of the specified Consequences (including, if applicable, a justification for why the maximum potential sanction was not imposed);*
>
> *(b) Publicly Report that decision in accordance with Rule 14;*
>
> *(c) send a copy of the decision to the Athlete or other Person and to any other party that has a right, further to Rule 13, to appeal the decision (and any such party may, within 15 days of receipt, request a copy of the full case file pertaining to the decision)."*

The Athlete's Commission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations

4. Rule 2 ADR sets out that the following shall constitute an Anti-Doping Rule Violation:

> *"2.1 Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample*
>
> *[...]*

[1] https://worldathletics.org/athletes/india/archana-jadhav-15089125

2.2 Use or Attempted Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method"

5. On 15 December 2024, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition in the Bajaj Allianz Pune Half Marathon in Pune, India, which was given code 8132524 (the "**Sample**") pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of World Athletics - AIU.

6. On 6 January 2025, the WADA-accredited laboratory in New Delhi, India (the "**Laboratory**") reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Sample based on the presence of Oxandrolone and its its Metabolites 17α-hydroxy-17β-methyl-2-oxa-5α-androstan-3-one and 17α-hydroxymethyl-17β-methyl-18-nor-2-oxa-5α-androst-13-en-3-one (the "**Adverse Analytical Finding**").

7. The AIU reviewed the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5 of the International Standard for Results Management ("**ISRM**") and determined that:

   7.1. the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption ("**TUE**") that had been granted (or that would be granted) for the Oxandrolone or its Metabolites found in the Sample; and

   7.2. there was no apparent departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations ("**ISTI**") or from the International Standard for Laboratories ("**ISL**") that could reasonably have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding.

8. Therefore, on 7 January 2025, the AIU notified the Athlete of the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 of the ISRM, including that the Adverse Analytical Finding may result in Anti-Doping Rule Violations pursuant to Rule 2.1 ADR and/or Rule 2.2 ADR, and of the imposition of an immediate Provisional Suspension.

9. The Athlete was also informed of her rights, inter alia, to request the B Sample analysis, to request copies of the laboratory documentation supporting the Adverse Analytical Finding and to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR by 14 January 2025.

10. On 8 January 2025, the Athlete responded to the AIU stating that she was unsure about the result and requested the B Sample analysis.

11. On 10 January 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete informing her of the costs and proposed date of the B Sample analysis and of the Athlete's right to attend (or have a representative attend on her behalf) the opening and the analysis of the B Sample. The Athlete was informed that she was required to make the full payment of the costs of the B Sample analysis to World Athletics by no later than 17 January 2025 (and was provided with full instructions for this purpose) and that if she failed to do so, then the AIU would be entitled to deem that the Athlete had irrevocably waived her right to the B Sample analysis[2].

[2] In accordance with Article 5.1.2.1(c) of the ISRM.

12. The Athlete failed to respond or to make the full payment of the costs for the B Sample analysis by 17 January 2025.

13. Therefore, on 22 January 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete and provided her with an extended deadline by which to make the full payment of the costs of the B Sample analysis to World Athletics and to confirm whether she, or a representative, would attend the opening and analysis of the B Sample at the Laboratory by no later than 24 January 2025. The AIU reiterated that if the Athlete failed to so, then she would be deemed to have irrevocably waived her right to the B Sample analysis in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1(c) of the ISRM.

14. The Athlete failed to respond or to make the full payment of the costs for the B Sample analysis by the extended 24 January 2025 deadline.

15. On 28 January 2025, the AIU informed the Athlete that she was deemed to have irrevocably waived her right to the B Sample analysis and invited the Athlete to provide any additional information to explain the Adverse Analytical Finding by no later than 31 January 2025.

16. On 29 January 2025, the Athlete wrote to the AIU stating that she had been admitted to hospital and asked for "*some days*".

17. On 5 February 2025, the Athlete submitted a diagnostic report from Agilus Diagnostics containing the results of several (negative) drug tests performed on a urine sample.

18. On 6 February 2025, the AIU acknowledged receipt of the Athlete's e-mail of 29 January and the additional document provided on 5 February 2025. The AIU provided the Athlete with a final deadline by which to make the full payment of the costs of the B Sample analysis to World Athletics by no later than 10 February 2025. The AIU reiterated that if the Athlete failed to make the payment, then she would be deemed to have irrevocably waived her right to the B Sample analysis in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1(c) of the ISRM. The AIU also invited the Athlete to provide any additional information/explation for the Adverse Analytical Finding by no later than Monday 10 February 2025.

19. On 10 February 2025, the Athlete wrote to the AIU stating "*I'm agree with you. I was not able to reply your mail because I was in hospital due to same health issues I'm so sorry for that*".

20. On 11 February 2025, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Charge in accordance with Rule 8.5.1 ADR and Article 7.1 ISRM confirming that she was being charged with Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR ("the **Charge**") and that the Consequences included (i) a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years and (ii) disqualification of her results on and since 15 December 2024.

21. The AIU invited the Athlete to respond to the Charge confirming how she wished to proceed by no later than 25 February 2025. The letter confirmed that, should the Athlete fail to challenge the AIU's assertion of the Anti-Doping Rule Violations or the Consequences, or fail to request a hearing, then she would be deemed to have waived her right to a hearing, admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences set out in the Charge in accordance with Rule 8.5.2(f) ADR.

22. On 25 February 2025, the Athlete replied to the Charge by e-mail stating "*I'm extremely sorry sir…I welcome your decision.*" The AIU responded by confirming that its understanding of the Athlete's response was that she did not require a hearing and that she was content for the AIU to proceed to issue a decision in her case.

23. The AIU informed the Athlete that she should confirm her position by signing and returning an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form that was enclosed with the Charge and that if she did so by the end of the same day, she would formally waive her right to a hearing of her case (and any further rights to contest, challenge or dispute the Anti-Doping Rule Violations or the Consequences), and the 4-year period of Ineligibility would automatically be reduced by one year.

24. The Athlete failed to respond by 25 March 2025.

25. On 26 February 2025, the AIU informed the Athlete that she had until no later than 3 March 2025 to confirm that she admitted that she had committed the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences specified in the Charge to benefit from an automatic one-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 by signing and returning the Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form that was enclosed with the Charge to the AIU.

26. The AIU also confirmed that if the Athlete failed to do so, then she would be deemed to have waived her right to a hearing, admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences set out in the Charge (i.e., including a period of Ineligibility of 4 years) and that the AIU would then issue a final decision in her case.

27. On 28 February 2025, the Athletics Federation of India ("**AFI**") also wrote to the Athlete enclosing the AIU's correspondence of 26 February 2025 and reminded the Athlete that she had until no later than 3 March 2025 by which to respond.

28. The Athlete failed to respond by 3 March 2025, or at all.

Consequences

29. Rule 10.2 ADR specifies that the period of Ineligibility for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.1 or Rule 2.2 shall be as follows:

> *"10.2.1 Save where Rule 10.2.4 applies, the period of Ineligibility will be four years where:*
>
> *(a) The anti-doping rule violation does not involve a Specified Substance or a Specified Method, unless the Athlete or other Person can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was not intentional.*
>
> *(b) The anti-doping rule violation involves a Specified Substance or a Specified Method and the Integrity Unit can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was intentional."*

1st Floor
6 Quai Antoine 1er
MC 98007, Monaco

30. Oxandrolone (and its Metabolites) is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2024 Prohibited List under the category S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids. It is a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times.

31. The period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore a period of four (4) years, unless the Athlete demonstrates that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional.

32. The Athlete has not demonstrated that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional. Therefore, the mandatory period of Ineligibility is a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years.

33. The Athlete failed to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accept the Consequences specified by the AIU in the Charge within twenty (20) days in accordance with Rule 10.8.1 ADR. The Athlete cannot therefore benefit from the one (1)-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility in accordance with this provision.

34. On the basis that the Athlete is deemed to have committed the Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR, in accordance with Rule 10.2.1 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:

    34.1. a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years commencing on 7 January 2025 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and

    34.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 15 December 2024, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

Publication

35. In accordance with Rule 8.5.6(b) ADR, the AIU shall publicly report this decision on the AIU's website.

Rights of Appeal

36. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.

37. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, the Athlete, WADA and the National Anti-Doping Agency of India ("**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 Rule 13.6.1 ADR.

38. 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 Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 17 March 2025