

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: 16.06.2026

Mr. Subhash Vasant R,
Sports- Boxing,
C/o Ranjith Kumar
Old No 6D, New No 15D,
Anga Mvtho Street Chennai
Tamil Nadu- 600093
Email- subhashvasanth10@gmail.com

Subj: Decision of the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel Case No.- 44/ADDP/2025.

NADA VS. Mr. Subhash Vasant R (ADAMS ID –RXSUMA98613)

The order containing the decision of the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel dated 11.06.2026 in respect of the final hearing of the above case held on 09.06.2026 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. The Secretary General, Boxing Federation of India, 3rd, Phase III, Udyog Vihar, Sector 20, Gurugram, Haryana – 122016.
3. International Boxing Association, Maison du Sport International, Avenue du Rhodanie 54, 1007 Lausanne Switzerland.

BEFORE THE ANTI-DOPING DISCIPLINARY PANEL

J.L.N. Stadium, Lodhi Road, New Delhi -110003

Case No. 44/ADDP/2025

(PROCEEDING CONDUCTED THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING)

In the matter of Mr. Subash Vasanth R (Sports-Boxing) for the violation of Articles 2.1 & 2.2 of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021

Quorum: *Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Chairperson*

Dr. Bikash Medhi, Member

Ms. Deepali Deshpande, Member

Present: *Mr. Prateek Dhanda, Advocate for NADA*

Mr. Subash Vasanth R, Athlete in -person

JUDGMENT DATED 11.06.2026

- A.** The present matter before this Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel (ADDP), constituted in accordance with Article 8 of the National Anti-Doping Rules, arises from an alleged anti-doping rule violation committed by *Mr. Subash Vasanth R (Sports-Boxing)*. These proceedings concern violations under Article 2.1, relating to the presence of a prohibited substance or its metabolites or markers in an athlete's sample, and 2.2, which pertains to the use or attempted use of a prohibited substance or method. For the purposes of this order, the National Anti-Doping Rules shall be referred to as the "ADR." Unless otherwise specified, all capitalised terms herein shall bear the meaning ascribed to them under the ADR.
- B.** The athlete is a National Level "Boxing" player.
- C.** That the brief facts of the case are as follows:
- i. That on 11.10.2025, a urine sample was collected from the athlete in-competition during the CM Trophy 2025, held at Chennai, Tamil Nadu. The sample was split into A and B portions and marked with Sample Code 1653991.

- ii. That A sample was tested at the National Dope Testing Laboratory and returned positive for the presence of Stimulants/Mephentermine and its metabolite phentermine. The substance is classified under S6. class of WADA's prohibited list.
- iii. The Initial Review found no Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) on record and no procedural deviations affecting the test's validity and not use through the permitted route.
- iv. That on 26.11.2025, NADA informed the athlete of the AAF through the notification of Adverse Analytical Finding and advised him of his rights, including (a) The right to request B-sample analysis within 7 days of receiving this notification, at their own expense (Article 2.1.2) (b) The right to obtain the laboratory documentation package at their own expense (c) The right to waive the hearing and accept the proposed consequences by signing the Accepted Consequences Form within 20 days of receiving this notification.
- v. That on 20.12.2025, the athlete sent an email and informed that 'No need of taking b sample test'.
- vi. That on 12.01.2026, the athlete sent another email replying to the adverse analytical finding reported in his sample.
- vii. That on 09.01.2026, formal Notice of Charge was issued to the Athlete for violation of Article 2.1 – Presence of a Prohibited Substance and Article 2.2 – Use of a Prohibited Substance.
- viii. The Athlete was notified through a letter dated 02.04.2026 that a Hearing Panel has 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.
- ix. The Disciplinary Panel scheduled a hearing on 26.05.2026, however despite advance hearing notice, the athlete did not appear before the panel. The Disciplinary Panel scheduled the hearing once again on 09.06.2026. In the disciplinary proceedings held on 09.06.2026, the parties addressed their respective arguments, following which the judgment was reserved.

D. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY THE ATHLETE ARE REPRODUCED HEREIN

During the hearing, the athlete submitted that he had consumed a medication recommended by a friend for weight reduction purposes. He contended that he was unaware that the medication could contain a prohibited substance and asserted that he had no intention to obtain any performance-enhancing benefit. Considering all the facts and circumstances of the case, it was requested that the matter be considered sympathetically and that a lenient view be taken.

E. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY NADA ARE REPRODUCED HEREIN:

- i. NADA contended that according to Article 2.1.1 of the Anti-Doping Rules 2021, it is the personal responsibility of every Athlete to ensure that no prohibited Substance enters his body. The Rules impose a strict liability on the Athlete and thus the presence of a prohibited substance in an athlete's body will constitute an anti-doping rule violation irrespective of the intention, knowledge, fault, or negligence.
- ii. Furthermore, the athlete cannot merely rely on the contention that he lacked the intention to dope. Rather, he must establish, by a balance of probabilities, that his conduct did not amount to an Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
- iii. In the present case, the athlete has claimed that he consumed the medication for weight reduction purposes; however, he has failed to produce any prescription or medical record in support of this claim. Furthermore, the prohibited substance detected in the athlete's sample is a stimulant that is commonly associated with performance-enhancing effects. Athletes are under a duty to exercise the utmost caution before ingesting any medication or supplement and are expected to verify whether any substance they intend to consume is included on the Prohibited List. The athlete's failure to undertake such verification demonstrates a lack of due diligence on his part.
- iv. Accordingly, NADA submitted that a violation has taken place, and the athlete has failed to discharge the burden of proving that the breach was without intent. Therefore, he will be held accountable and appropriate sanction must ensue.

F. OBSERVATION AND FINDINGS OF THE ADDP

- i. The Panel has given due consideration to the submissions made by both parties and has meticulously examined the evidence and material placed on record. Upon thorough evaluation of the facts and arguments made during the hearing, the athlete has not made out the case for any relief, the athlete have accepted the result of sample A conducted by NADA, and have not come out with a plausible defence to demolish the said report or convince the ADDP about the administration of the said banned substance was not due to no fault of the athlete and the ADDP was left with no alternative but to conclude that the athlete's actions have indeed resulted in an Anti-Doping Rule Violation (ADVR).
- ii. As per the anti-doping rules, the burden of proof in establishing that the anti-doping rule violation was not committed intentionally lies with the Athlete. To rebut this presumption of intentionality, the Athlete must establish on a balance of probabilities that she does not meet the threshold of either direct or intent within the meaning of Article 10.2.3 of the Rules. The relevant Article is reproduced below:


“Article 10.2.3 reproduces here as “the term “intentional” is meant to identify those Athletes or other Persons who engage in conduct which they knew constituted an anti doping rule violation or knew that there was a significant risk that the conduct might constitute or result in an anti-doping rule violation and manifestly disregarded that risk”.

- iii. The Panel has determined that the Athlete has not met the evidential burden required to demonstrate that the ADRV was unintentional as per the rules. Consequently, ADRV was deemed intentional within the meaning of Article 10.2.3 of ADR and thus the appropriate sanction under Article 10.2.1.1 is 4 years of ineligibility.
- iv. The Panel has considered the athlete's plea that he consumed the medication for the purpose of weight reduction. However, the athlete has failed to produce any prescription or supporting medical documentation to substantiate this claim. The Panel further notes that the athlete did not declare the use of any such medication on the Doping Control Form at the time of sample collection. In these circumstances, the explanation advanced by the athlete lacks credibility and is not accepted. The Panel also notes that the prohibited substance detected in the athlete's sample is a stimulant, a category of substances that is commonly misused by athletes for performance-enhancing purposes.
- v. In view of the facts and circumstances stated above, the Panel holds that the Athlete is liable for sanctions under Article 10.2.1.1 and liable for ineligibility for 4 years. In the present case, since the Athlete had been provisionally suspended, the Panel accordingly holds that the Athlete's period of his ineligibility for four (04) years shall commence from the date on which the notification was sent, i.e., 26.11.2025.
- vi. We also direct that under Article 10.10, all other competitive results obtained by the athlete from the date of sample collection i.e., 11.10.2025 shall be disqualified with all resulting consequences including forfeiture of medals, points, and prizes.



(Sanjay Kumar)

Chairperson



(Dr. Bikash Medhi)

Medical Member

Dr. Bikash Medhi
डा. बिकास मेधी
Professor/प्रोफेसर
Department of Pharmacology
भेषजगुण विज्ञान विभाग
PGIMER, Chandigarh - 160 012
डा. बिकास मेधी पी.जी.आई.एम.ई.आर. चण्डीगढ़-160 012



(Deepali Deshpande)

Sports Member