

National Anti Doping Agency
J.L.N Stadium, Hall No. 103-104, First Floor,
Lodhi Road, New Delhi 110 003
Telefax: 011-24368274

To,

Date: 10.06.2026

Mr. Lalruatfela,
Sports- **Weightlifting,**
S/o Sh. Lallawmawma
R/o Mualveng, Bungzung, Champhai
Mizoram – 796320
Email- felatlau999@gmail.com

Subj: Decision of the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel Case No.- 46/ADDP/2025.

NADA VS. Mr. Lalruatfela (ADAMS ID – LALAMA26667)

The order containing the decision of the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel dated 05.06.2026 in respect of the final hearing of the above case held on 27.05.2026 is enclosed.

Please note that according to Article 13.2.2 of Anti-Doping Rules of NADA 2021, **the time to file an appeal to the National Anti-Doping Appeal Panel shall be twenty-one (21) days from the date of receipt of this decision by the appealing party.** The appeal may be filed by email at antidoping-panel@gov.in or may be filed directly at the office of the Anti- Doping Panel at J.L.N. Stadium, Ground Floor, Staircase No. 5, Near AICS Office, Lodi Road, New Delhi- 110003.

WADA and the International Federation have a right to appeal against the decision in accordance with Anti-Doping Rules.

Also please note that according to Article 10.7.1- (**Substantial Assistance in Discovering or Establishing Anti-Doping Rule Violations**)- Any period of Ineligibility imposed may be partially suspended if you assist NADA in uncovering and/or establishing an ADRV by another Athlete or Athlete Support Personnel pursuant to Article 10.7.1 ADR. Further, the athlete is subjected to a doping control test during the ineligibility period, therefore, the athlete is required to update his residential address as and when changed.

Copy of the NADA Anti-Doping Rules 2021 may be downloaded from NADA website at the following link: - <https://nadaindia.yas.gov.in>

The receipt of this communication may be acknowledged.

Encl: 04 Sheets.


(Yasir Arafat)

Sr. Programme Associate (Legal)

Copy forwarded together with the copy of the order containing the decision of the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel for information and action deemed necessary:

1. The World Anti-Doping Agency, Stock Exchange Tower, 800 Place Victoria (Suit 1700) P. O. Box 180, Montreal (Quebec), H4Z 1B7, Canada.
2. Indian Weightlifting Federation, C-2/18, Sector- 31, NOIDA, UTTAR PRADESH-201301
3. International Weightlifting Federation, Maison du Sport International, Av. de Rhodanie 54, Switzerland- 1007, Lausanne.

BEFORE THE ANTI-DOPING DISCIPLINARY PANEL
In the matter of Mr. Lalruatfela for the violation of Articles 2.1 & 2.2 of National
Anti-Doping Rules, 2021

Case No.46ADDP/2025

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH VIRTUAL MODE)

Quorum: *Mr. Prakash Gautam, Chairperson*
 Dr. Vikaas Sharma, Member
 Ms. Archana Surve, Member

Present: Mr. Lalruatfela, Athlete in-person
 Mr. Hemant Yadav, Advocate for NADA

JUDGEMENT DATED 05.06.2026

- A. The present proceedings before this Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel “ADDP” constituted under the National Anti-Doping Rules **Article 8** emanate from the violation of the National Anti-Doping Rules 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). The Anti-Doping Rules herein after referred as “**the ADR**” in abbreviated form. Capitalized terms used, but not defined in this letter, are as defined in the ADR against Mr. Lalruatfela “**the athlete**”.
- B. The athlete is a National Level “**Weightlifting**” player.
- C. **That the brief facts of the case are as follows:**
1. That on 30.11.2025, a NADA Doping Control Officer (“**DCO**”) collected an out-of-competition urine sample from the athlete held at Patiala, Punjab, assisted by the DCO, the athlete split the sample into two separate bottles, which were given reference numbers **A 1655722** (the "A sample") and **B 1655722** (the "B sample").

2. The sample was transported to the World Anti-Doping Agency ("WADA")-accredited Laboratory, National Dope Testing Laboratory, Delhi. The Laboratory analysed the A sample in accordance with the procedures set out in WADA's International Standard for Laboratories. Analysis of the A sample returned an Adverse Analytical Finding ("AAF") for the presence of Stanozolol metabolites 16 beta-dydroxy stanozolol, Stanozolol-IN-glucuronide- Anabolic Androgenic Steroids of WADA's Prohibited List as a non-specified substance.
3. It is also pertinent to clarify that the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic use exemption.
4. The initial review of the A sample, as per **Article 7.2** of NADA and **Article 5.1.1** of the International Standards for Result Management ("ISRM"), shows that there was no apparent deviation from the International Standard for Testing and Investigation ("ISTI") or the International Standard for Laboratories ("ISL") that could undermine the validity of the AAF.
5. The athlete was notified of the adverse analytical findings in Sample No. **A 1655722** via a notification dated 09.01.2026. The sample confirmed the Adverse Analytical Finding on 24.12.2025, whereby the athlete was informed about the AAF in his sample reports. The analysis also highlighted the violation of Article 2.1 and Article 2.2 of the National Anti-Doping Rule, 2021, due to the presence of Stanozolol metabolites 16 beta-dydroxy stanozolol, Stanozolol-IN-glucuronide- Anabolic Androgenic Steroids.
6. The athlete on 12.01.2026 opted for opening and analysis of the B-sample. The B-Sample analysis report confirmed the finding of the A-sample.
7. The athlete was subsequently served with a Notice of Charge, bearing No. K-11/03/2026-SPO, dated 04.02.2026. This Notice of Charge, issued under the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021, accused the athlete of violating Articles 2.1 and 2.2 of the National Anti Doping Rules, 2021.
8. The Athlete was notified through a letter dated 27.04.2026 that a Hearing Panel had been constituted to address the alleged anti-doping rule violation. The notification informed the Athlete of his right to respond to the charges

and the potential consequences. It also indicated that the Athlete could submit written submissions, along with all supporting documents, to the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel within twenty (20) days from the receipt of the notice.

9. The Anti Doping Disciplinary Panel convened a virtual hearing on 27.05.2026 wherein both the parties remained present and order reserved.

D. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY THE ATHLETE ARE REPRODUCED HEREIN

The Athlete appeared in the hearing himself without any legal expert person and also refused any legal aid offered by the disciplinary panel, but except for a simple denial of the charge, he did not produce any documentary evidence in his support. The Athlete has not made any averments in reply to the disciplinary panel regarding how the prohibited non-specified substance is present in your urine sample.

E. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY NADA ARE REPRODUCED HEREIN:

1. NADA submitted that under Article 2.1.1 of the Rules, it is the personal duty of each Athlete to ensure that no prohibited Substance enters his/her body. The liability cast on the Athlete under the rules is strict and considerations of intent, knowledge, fault or negligence are not required to be proved for establishing an Anti-Doping rule violation. This is the matter for consideration under strict liability of sports person him/herself ensure that did not take any unnatural contaminant supplement might be having prohibited substance so the onus of burden to prove that he or she did not intake such substance only on the same.
2. The athlete cannot simply plead her lack of intention to dope instead he must prove by a balance of probabilities that he has not engaged in conduct that constituted an ADRV.
3. The athlete being an experienced athlete is expected to exercise utmost care while taking any supplement and simply cannot shift his burden to anyone. In view of the same, it is submitted that a doping violation has occurred and the Athlete has been unable to discharge the onus cast on him to show that the

violation was unintentional. Thus, appropriate sanction must ensue in the present matter.

F. OBSERVATION OF THE ADDP

1. We have carefully heard the Athlete alone from his side and NADA counsel another side and also gone through the available material provided to us. After reviewing the submissions of NADA counsel, the ADDP concludes that the conduct of the athlete led to the Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
2. The athlete is responsible for knowing what constitutes an ADRV and which substance are prohibited. The CAS case law is clear when an Athlete consumes a product without making any proper verification, they act with “indirect” intent and a four-years ineligibility is warranted by the Code article 10.2.1.1. The athlete has completely failed to establish that the said Anti-Doping Rule Violation was unintentional.

G. FINDING OF THE ADDP

In view of the above-mentioned facts, circumstances, precedents, and rules, **it is held that the athlete has violated Article 2.1 and Article 2.2 of the NADR, 2021. He is hereby sanctioned with an ineligibility of a total four (04) years as per Article 10.2.1.1 of NADR, 2021, beginning from the date of Provisional Suspension, i.e. 09.01.2026.**

H. DISQUALIFICATION OF RESULT

The ADDP directs that, in accordance with Article 10.10, all competitive results obtained by the athlete from the date of sample collection, 30.11.2025, shall stand disqualified, with all resulting consequences, including forfeiture of medals, points, and prizes.



Prakash Gautam
(Chairperson)



Dr. Vikaas Sharma
(Medical Member)



Archana Surve
(Sports Member)