

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: 11.03.2026

Mr. Honey Dabas,
Sports- Para-Powerlifting,
S/o Sh. Satish
R/o H.No. 535, Tau Bihari
Marg, Village Ladpur,
North West Delhi - 110081
Email- honey.dabas2004@gmail.com

Subj: Decision of the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel Case No.- 127/ADDP/2024.

NADA VS. Mr. Honey Dabas (ADAMS ID – DAHOMA64271)

The order containing the decision of the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel dated 05.03.2026 in respect of the final hearing of the above case held on 18.02.2026 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: 7 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. Paralympic Committee of India, 28, Sports Authority of Karnataka Building, Gate no. 2, Sree Kanteerava Stadium, Kasturba Road, Bengaluru-560001 (India).
3. International Paralympic Committee, Dahlmannstraße 2, 53113 Bonn, Germany.

BEFORE THE ANTI-DOPING DISCIPLINARY PANEL

**In the matter of Mr. Honey Dabas for the violation of Articles 2.1, 2.2 & 2.5 of
National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021**

Case No. 127 /ADDP/2024

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH VIRTUAL MODE)

Quorum: *Mr. Rupinder Pal Singh, Chairperson*
Dr. Bikash Medhi, Medical Member
Mr. Bharat Chetri, Sports Member

Present: *Mr. Prateek Dhanda, counsel for NADA and Mr. Yasir Arafat law officer for NADA.*
Mr. Akhilesh Dwivedi from NADA
Mr. Sumeet Shokeen, counsel for Athlete along with Athlete

JUDGEMENT DATED 05.03.2026

- 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). Article 2.5 (Tampering or Attempted Tampering with any part of Doping Control by an Athlete or Other Person) These are referred to as “**the ADR**” in this order. Capitalized terms used, but not defined in this letter, are as defined in the ADR against Mr. Honey Dabas “Sport Discipline: Para- Powerlifting | 88 Kg”.
- B.** The athlete is a National Level “**Sport Discipline: Para- Powerlifting | 88 Kg**” player.
- C.** That the brief facts of the case are as follows:

1. That on 16.12.2024, during '2nd Delhi State Para- Powerlifting Championship -2024-25, held at New Delhi, a NADA Doping Control Officer ("DCO") collected a urine sample from the athlete. Assisted by the DCO, the athlete split the sample into two separate bottles, which were given reference numbers **A 1515199** (the "A sample") and **B 1515199** (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 following substance:

- *S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids (AAS)/ Metandienone metabolite 17beta-hydroxymethyl, 17alpha-methyl-18nor-androst-1,4,13-trien-3one*
- *S4. Hormone and Metabolic Modulators/ Clomifene*

Above mentioned substances are listed under **S1.1 and S4** respectively of the WADA's 2024 Prohibited List, which are *non-specified substances*.

According to the records available, athlete do not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption ("TUE") to justify the presence of the above '*Anabolic Androgenic Steroids (AAS) & Hormone and Metabolic Modulators*' in his system.

3. The initial review of the 'A' sample, as per **Article 7.2** of NADR and **Article 5.1.1** of the International Standards for Result Management ("ISRM") and found that, according to NADA India records, (a) no applicable Therapeutic Use Exemption ("TUE") has been or is in process of being granted to you, (b) there was no apparent departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations ("ISTI") or the International Standard for Laboratories

("ISL") that could undermine the validity of the AAF, and (c) the AAF is not caused by the ingestion of the Prohibited Substance through a permitted route insofar as "**Anabolic Androgenic Steroids & Hormone and Metabolic Modulators**" are banned irrespective of the route of ingestion.

4. The athlete was notified of the adverse analytical findings in sample **no. 1515199** via a notification dated 08.01.2025, whereby the athlete was informed about the AAF in his sample reports for **S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids (AAS)/ *Metandienone metabolite 17beta-hydroxymethyl, 17alpha-methyl-18nor-androst-1,4,13-trien-3one and S4. Hormone and Metabolic Modulators/ Clomifene*** And (b) athlete rights under the NADA Anti-Doping Rules including the right to accept the AAF and the right to request for the Laboratory Documentation Package ("LDP") and/ or the B- Sample opening and analysis.
5. That NADA has received no reply from the athlete with regard to opening and analysis of 'B' sample, hence your right towards 'B' sample opening and analysis is deemed waived off.
6. The allegation against the Athlete was also that he submitted forged medical documents during the result management process, amounting to Tampering in violation of Article 2.5 of the Rules.
7. As per Rules, both ADRVs were treated to single anti-doping rule violation subject to Article 10.9.3.3 where NADA establishes that an Athlete or other Person violated Article 2.5 in connection with the Doping Control process for an underlying asserted anti-doping rule violation, the violation of Article 2.5 shall be treated as a stand- alone first violation and the period of Ineligibility for such violation shall be served consecutively, rather than concurrently, with the period of Ineligibility, if any, imposed for the underlying anti-doping rule violation. Where this Article 10.9.3.3 is applied, the violations taken together shall constitute a single violation for purposes of Article 10.9.1.

8. The Athlete was notified through a letter dated 18.10.2025 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. In the disciplinary proceedings held on 18.02.2026, the parties addressed their respective arguments following which the judgment was reserved.

D. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY THE ATHLETE ARE REPRODUCED HEREIN

1. During the ADDP panel hearing, the athlete firmly asserted that he had not intentionally consumed any prohibited substances. His counsel has submitted that the athlete was under medical treatment for his ailments and disability with different doctors/ Ayurveda practitioners and the Medical Documents as filed earlier by the undersigned are not forged to the best of the knowledge of the athlete. It is further submitted that a neighbour/ co-villager of the athlete namely Mr. Rajbeer R/o House No. 476, Tau Bihari Marg, Village Ladpur, Delhi took the athlete for treatment at Dr. Baba Sahib Ambedkar Hospital, Rohini, Delhi with him and consulted a person who was known to Mr. Rajbeer and the athlete was informed to complete the course of medicine prescribed in the said Medical Document as the said medicines were not available at any chemist shop in the absence of prescription.
2. The Athlete expressed concern that the supplements might have led to the presence of prohibited substances in his system. He emphasized that he has not taken anything in injectable form and is unaware of the source of the prohibited substances found in his body.
3. The athlete emphasized his lack of intent to violate anti-doping rules and expressed his belief that the contamination was inadvertent, arising from the supplements he trusted.

4. Lastly, on Article 2.5 Tampering or Attempted tampering with any part of doping control by an Athlete or Other person. The counsel for the athlete do not wish to argue on Article 2.5 and only requested for leniency from the panel as he is a para- athlete.

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 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.
2. The athlete cannot simply plead his 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 analytical report issued by NDTL, New Delhi, conclusively establishes the presence of the prohibited substances. The chain of custody was maintained in conformity with the ISL. No irregularity or tampering has been alleged or demonstrated. The AAF, therefore, stands unassailable.
4. 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. NADA submitted that appropriate sanction must ensure as per rules keeping in view the aggravating factors for the consumption of multiple substances.
5. The principle of deterrence, as recognized in CAS 2016/0/4504 IAAF vs ARAF & Vladimir Mokhnev, underscores that the objective of anti-doping rules is not merely punitive but, also preventive.
6. That the aforementioned factual matrix as well as the report submitted by the Respondent's Officer clearly showcases that the Athlete has taken contradictory pleas. Firstly, the athlete takes the plea that he had consumed

the Prohibited substances under the guidance and requisite prescriptions issued by the Govt. doctor. However, as soon as the Athlete is confronted with the notification under Article 2.5 and the Investigation Report quoted hereinabove, the Athlete make a complete U-turn and lays the blame on one neighbour Mr. Rajbeer, upon the third party.

7. Thus, the Athlete has committed multiple violations, he must be maximum sanctioned under the rules.

F. OBSERVATION OF THE ADDP

1. We have carefully heard both the parties and also gone through the available material provided to us. After reviewing the submissions of both parties, the ADDP concludes that the conduct of the athlete led to the Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
2. In the present case, the Athlete has tested positive for 2 Prohibited substances therefore, the athlete is liable for a sanction of six (6) years as per aggravating circumstances provided under Article 10.4 of the ADR. After considering all the facts, the Panel has no reason to disbelieve and concludes that the Athlete has violated Article 2.5 of the 2021 ADR, which amounts to Tampering, the violation of Article 2.5 would be stand alone and would run consecutively de-hors the sanction under Article 2.1 & 2.2 as per Article 10.9.3.3 of the ADR. The athlete is entitled to a sanction of 4 years separately, then the sanction of 6 years under Article 2.1 & 2.2.
3. The athlete has failed to establish that the said Anti-Doping Rule Violation was unintentional. The athlete was also unable to satisfy the ADDP that there was no significant fault or negligence on his part. Not being aware of the Rules is not a valid ground for relief under the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021.

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**


NADA ADR, 2021. He is hereby sanctioned with an ineligibility of four (4) years as per Article 10.2.1.1. Under Article 10.4 of NADR in the presence of aggravating circumstances the ineligibility shall be increased by an additional period of ineligibility up to two (2) years and under Article 2.5 of the ADR four (4) years separately i.e. depending on the seriousness of the violation and the nature of the aggravating circumstances involved in the case. The total sanction for a period of 10 years shall commence from the date of provisional suspension, i.e., 08.01.2025.

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, 16.12.2024, shall stand disqualified, with all resulting consequences, including forfeiture of medals, points, and prizes.


Mr. Rupinder Pal Singh
(Chairperson)


Dr. Bilkash Medhi
(Medical Member)


Mr. Bharat Chetri
(Sports Member)