Athletics Integrity Unit

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

Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Sneha Kolleri

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 Sneha Kolleri ("the **Athlete**") is a 26-year-old sprinter 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:

[1] https://worldathletics.org/athletes/india/sneha-kolleri-14717115

"2.1 Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample

[...]

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

5. On 24 March 2025, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition in Trivandrum, India, pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of the National Anti-Doping Agency of India ("**NADA**") which was given the code 1515531 (the "**First Trivandrum Sample**").

6. Initial analysis of the First Trivandrum Sample by the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited laboratory in New Delhi, India (the "**New Delhi Laboratory**") did not reveal the presence of any Prohibited Substances.

7. On 31 March 2025, the Athlete provided a further urine Sample Out-of-Competition in Trivandrum, India, pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of NADA which was given the code 1515537 (the "**Second Trivandrum Sample**").

8. Initial analysis of the Second Trivandrum Sample by the New Delhi Laboratory did not reveal the presence of any Prohibited Substances.

9. On 30 April 2025, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition in Chandigarh, India, pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of NADA, which was given the code 1514604 (the "**Chandigarh Sample**").

10. Initial analysis of the Chandigarh Sample by the New Delhi Laboratory did not reveal the presence of any Prohibited Substances.

11. On 10 May 2025, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition in Guangzhou, China, pursuant to Target Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of the AIU – World Athletics, which was given the code 8097111 (the "**Guangzhou Sample**").

12. Analysis of the Guangzhou Sample by the WADA accredited laboratory in Paris, France (the '**Paris Laboratory**') revealed the presence of Stanozolol Metabolite 17-EpiStanozolol-1'N-glucuronide (the "**Guangzhou Adverse Analytical Finding**").

13. Stanozolol is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2025 Prohibited List under the category S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids (AAS). It is a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times.

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

    14.1. the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption ("**TUE**") that had been granted (or would be granted) for the 17-EpiStanozolol-1'N-glucuronide found in the Guangzhou Sample; and

14.2. 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 Guangzhou Adverse Analytical Finding.

15. Therefore, in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 ISRM, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations (the "**Guangzhou Notice of Allegation**") on 23 May 2025, imposed a Provisional Suspension (effective immediately) and invited the Athlete to attend an online interview with the AIU.

16. On 5 June 2025, the Athlete provided her response to the Notice of Allegation and made an application to lift the Provisional Suspension. Her application to lift the Provisional Suspension was made on the basis that she was able to demonstrate that the violation was likely to have involved a Contaminated Product.

17. Specifically, the Athlete referred to a supplement she had been taking called 'Muscletech Nitrotech 100% Whey Gold Protein (Double Chocolate flavour)' (the "**Product**"), and alleged that the Product had been identified in an advisory circular issued by NADA via WhatsApp to Athletes as a supplement known to have been contaminated with Prohibited Substances.

18. The Athlete also provided evidence of her purchase of the Product from Nutrabay Retail Limited on 13 March 2025 and explained that, following notification of the Guangzhou Adverse Analytical Finding, she had submitted a sample of the Product to a laboratory in India for analysis (Equinox Labs).

19. On 5 June 2025, the AIU responded to the Athlete's application to lift the Provisional Suspension and requested:

19.1. A full extract of the WhatsApp chat history for the WhatsApp group chat in which the Athlete received the NADA advisory circular(s);

19.2. Full unredacted copies of the advisory circulars issued by NADA;

19.3. Any order confirmation details sent to the Athlete for her order of the Product on 13 March 2025;

19.4. Confirmation of the batch/lot number and expiry date of the Product, including pictures of the same;

19.5. A full and detailed breakdown of her ingestion of the Product between the date the Athlete received the Product, and when the Guangzhou Sample was collected from her on 10 May 2025; and

19.6. The date by which the Athlete expected to receive the results of the analysis by Equinox Labs.

20. On 6 June 2025, the AIU received the Athlete's response to its request for further information, confirming the Product had batch number MT25031 and expiry date December 2026. The Athlete also explained that she had consumed two scoops (each weighing approximately 33g) of the Product each day from 23 March 2025 onwards.

21. On 11 June 2025, the Athlete attended an interview (by video conference) with AIU representatives. During that interview, the Athlete stated, in summary, that:

    21.1. She had never knowingly or intentionally consumed Stanozolol;

    21.2. She ordered the Product on 13 March 2025 via a website Nutrabay.com and began using the Product on or around 22 March 2025, up until 9 May 2025, consuming two scoops daily.

    21.3. Her choice to purchase and consume the Product was made independently without any recommendation from any coaches and/or officials, instead choosing it as it is a well-known brand in India;

    21.4. She had discussed her use of the Product with a nutritionist that visited a training camp on one occasion;

    21.5. She was not prescribed, and did not take, any medication in the three months preceding collection of the Guangzhou Sample;

    21.6. On 21 May 2025, a PDF document had been shared in an athletes' WhatsApp group the Athlete was part of which listed various supplements that had been flagged by NADA as being contaminated with Stanozolol, including 'Nitro Whey' and

    21.7. She had submitted the Product for testing to determine whether it had been contaminated with Stanozolol.

22. On 10 July 2025, the AIU received the results of the analysis of the Product. The Athlete alleged that the analysis report confirmed the presence of Stanozolol in the Product.

23. On 23 July 2025, the AIU requested the following information from the Athlete:

    23.1. Confirmation of the actual/estimated concentration of Stanozolol in the Product detected by Equinox Labs;

    23.2. The limit of detection for the analytical method that was used for the Product testing;

    23.3. The full details of the analysis undertaken, including the supporting analytical documents; and

    23.4. Confirmation of whether the Athlete had retained any of the Product in her possession.

24. On 28 July 2025, the Athlete confirmed to the AIU that she had around two scoops of the Product remaining in her possession.

25. On 6 August 2025, the AIU received the supporting analytical documents for the testing of the Product, including the chromatograms.

26. The AIU reviewed the chromatograms and sought the opinion of an independent scientific expert, Professor Martial Saugy, as to whether they confirmed the presence of Stanozolol in the Product.

27. On 7 August 2025, Professor Saugy confirmed that the chromatograms from the testing of the Product indicated that no Stanozolol had been detected in the Product.

28. On 12 August 2025, the AIU requested that the Athlete provide the remaining two scoops of the Product in her possession (in its original packaging) to NADA so that it could be sent to the New Delhi Laboratory for testing.

29. Separately, through NADA, the AIU obtained a sealed container of Muscletech Nitrotech 100% Whey Gold Protein (Double Chocolate flavour) with batch number MT25157 and an expiry date of December 2026[2], which was sent to the New Delhi Laboratory for analysis.

30. On 1 September 2025, at the request of the AIU, the Athlete sent the remaining two scoops of the Product in her possession to the New Delhi Laboratory, via NADA, to be analysed.

31. In the interim, as part of its investigation into the Athlete's explanation, the AIU had arranged for the Chandigarh Sample and the Second Trivandrum Sample to be transferred to the Paris Laboratory for further analysis.

32. On 1 August 2025, the Paris Laboratory reported that its further analysis of the Chandigarh Sample (collected on 30 April 2025 and initially reported as negative by the New Delhi Laboratory - see paragraph 10 *supra*) had revealed the presence of the Stanozolol Metabolites 16β-hydroxystanozolol-O-glucuronide and Stanozolol-1N-glucuronide (the "**Chandigarh Adverse Analytical Finding**").

33. On 7 August 2025, the Paris Laboratory confirmed that upon further analysis no Prohibited Substances had been detected in the Second Trivandrum Sample (provided on 31 March 2025).

34. NADA (as Results Management Authority) reviewed the Chandigarh Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5 of the ISRM and determined that:

    34.1. the Athlete did not have a TUE that had been granted (or that would be granted) for the 16β-hydroxystanozolol-O-glucuronide and Stanozolol-1N-glucuronide found in the Chandigarh Sample; and

    34.2. there was no apparent departure from the ISTI or from the ISL that could reasonably have caused the Chandigarh Adverse Analytical Finding.

35. Therefore, in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 ISRM, NADA issued the Athlete with a further Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations (the "**Chandigarh Notice of Allegation**") on 23 September 2025 and requested her response by no later than 8 October 2025.

36. On 24 September 2025, the New Delhi Laboratory reported the results of its analysis of the two scoops of the Product the Athlete had provided, and the sealed container of Muscletech

[2] The batch number of the product obtained by the AIU is different to the batch number of the Product (MT25031) but has the same expiry date, December 2026.

Nitrotech 100% Whey Gold Protein (Double Chocolate flavour) obtained separately by the AIU.

37. The analysis confirmed the presence of Stanozolol in the (unsealed) Product that the Athlete had provided to NADA at an estimated concentration of 0.157mg/g.

38. No Stanozolol was detected in the sealed container of Muscletech Nitrotech 100% Whey Gold Protein (Double Chocolate flavour) that had been sourced by the AIU.

39. According to an initial opinion that the AIU obtained from independent scientific expert, Prof. Christianne Ayotte, based on the estimated concentration of Stanozolol detected by the New Delhi Laboratory in the Product (0.157mg/g) and noting that the Product contained a total of 1810g, this would equate to a total of circa 284mg of Stanozolol being contained in the Product. This is the same as approximately 28 x 10mg pills of Stanozolol (which are typically available online)[3].

40. On 16 October 2025, NADA transferred its responsiblty for Results Management for the Chandigarh Adverse Analytical Finding to the AIU to be dealt with at the same time as the Guangzhou Adverse Analytical Finding.

41. On 20 November 2025, the Athlete attended a second interview with AIU representatives by video conference. During that interview, the Athlete largely repeated what she had said in her first interview on 11 June 2025.

42. The AIU confronted the Athlete with information which contradicted the explanation she had given in her previous interview relating to her ingestion of the Product, i.e., that the results of the analysis of the Second Trivandrum Sample the Athlete provided on 31 March 2025 (negative) contradicted her assertion that she had been ingesting two scoops per day of the Product (contaminated with Stanozolol) since around 22 March 2025.

43. The Athlete asserted that the reason the Second Trivandrum Sample was negative could be because she was only taking one scoop of the Product per day.

44. On 29 January 2026, the Paris Laboratory reported that further analysis of the First Trivandrum Sample (provided on 24 March 2025) also did not reveal the presence of any Prohibited Substances[4].

45. On 17 February 2026, the AIU issued a Decision rejecting the Athlete's application to lift her Provisional Suspension on the basis that the findings from the AIU investigation (as set out

[3] For the avoidance of any doubt, the AIU reserves its rights in full in this respect, including to assert further Anti-Doping Rule Violations against the Athlete (including for Tampering or Attempted Tampering pursuant to Rule 2.5) and to seek further/additional Consequences.

[4] The AIU noted that the negative result in the First Trivandrum Sample collected on 24 March 2025 further undermined and contradicted the explanation given by the Athlete in her first interview with AIU representatives on 11 June 2025 that she had been ingesting the Product (which was contaminated with Stanozolol) since around 22 March 2025.

above) contradicted her claim that the violations were likely to have involved a Contaminated Product.

46. The AIU remained satisfied in the circumstances that the Athlete had committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations as set out in the Guangzhou and Chandigarh Notices of Allegation.

47. Therefore, on 17 February 2026, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Charge ("the **Charge**") in accordance with Rule 8.5.1 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 and invited her to confirm how she would like to proceed.

48. On 3 March 2026, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete.

Consequences

49. This is the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.

50. Rule 10.2 ADR specifies that the period of Ineligibility for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.1 ADR or Rule 2.2 ADR 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.*
>
> *10.2.2 If Rule 10.2.1 does not apply, then (subject to Rule 10.2.4(a)) the period of Ineligibility will be two years."*

51. Stanozolol is listed under the WADA 2025 Prohibited List under the category S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids. It is a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times.

52. 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.

53. 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.

54. However, Rule 10.8.1 ADR provides that an athlete potentially subject to an asserted period of Ineligibility of four (4) years or more may benefit from a one (1)-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility based on an early admission and acceptance of sanction:

> *"10.8.1 One year reduction for certain anti-doping rule violations based on early admission and acceptance of sanction.*

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

> *Where the Integrity Unit notifies an Athlete or other Person of an anti-doping rule violation charge that carries an asserted period of Ineligibility of four (4) or more years (including any period of Ineligibility asserted under Rule 10.4), if the Athlete or other Person admits the violation and accepts the asserted period of Ineligibility no later than 20 days after receiving the Notice of Charge, the Athlete or other Person may receive a one (1) year reduction in the period of Ineligibility asserted by the Integrity Unit. Where the Athlete or other Person receives the one (1) year reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility under this Rule 10.8.1, no further reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility will be allowed under any other Rule."*

55. A Notice of Charge was issued to the Athlete on 17 February 2026. On 3 March 2026, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete confirming that she admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the asserted period of Ineligibility.

56. The Athlete shall therefore receive a one (1) year reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 based on an early admission and acceptance of sanction.

57. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR, in accordance with Rules 9, 10.2.1 and 11 ADR and the application of Rule 10.8.1 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:

    57.1. a period of Ineligibility of three (3) years commencing on 23 May 2025 (the date of Provisional Suspension);

    57.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 30 April 2025 (the date of the Chandigarh Sample), with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

58. The Athlete has accepted the above Consequences for her Anti-Doping Rule Violations and has expressly waived her right to have those Consequences determined by the Disciplinary Tribunal at a hearing.

59. As a Consequence of the disqualification of the Athlete's individual results on and since 30 April 2025, the results of any relay team in which the Athlete competed as a member on and since 30 April 2025 (the date of the Chandigarh Sample) are also disqualified, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

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

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

62. Further to Rule 13.2.3 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 Rule 13.6.1 ADR.

63. 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, 19 March 2026