

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: 08.06.2026

Mr. Mohit Rathee
S/o Shri Randhir
R/o Village Lakanmazra, Distt. Rohtak
Haryana, India- 124514
Email- monurathee22222@gmail.com

Subj: Decision of the Anti-Doping Appeal Panel (“ADDP”) Case No.- 08/ADAP/2025

**In the Matter of “Mr. Mohit Rathee (A DAMS ID –RAMOMA75115)
Vs. National Anti-Doping Agency (NADA)”**

The order containing the decision of the Anti-Doping Appeal Panel dated 5.06.2026 in respect of the final hearing of the above case held on 22.04.2026 is enclosed.

The receipt of this communication may be acknowledged.

Encl:12 Sheets.



(Yasir Arafat)

Sr. Programmer Associate (Legal)

Copy forwarded together with the copy of the order containing the decision of the Anti-Appeal 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. Amateur Kabaddi Federation of India E-386 Cabin-B (Basement) Greater Kailash
Part 1 New Delhi – 110 048
3. International Kabaddi Federation , 2, Akanksha, Ajmer Road, Jaipur, Rajasthan - India
302021.

BEFORE THE ANTI-DOPING APPEAL PANEL

J.L.N. Stadium, Lodhi Road, New Delhi -110 003

Appeal No. 8/ADAP/2025

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH VIRTUAL MODE)

IN THE MATTER OF:

Mr. Mohit Rathee (Sports–Kabaddi) APPELLANT

Vs

National Anti-Doping AgencyRESPONDENT

**Quorum:Ms. Geetanjali Sharma, Chairperson
Dr. Rana Chengappa, Member
Ms. Rani Rampal, Sports Member**

Present: Advocate Arnav Singhal, Counsel along with Mr. Mohiti Rathee, Athlete in-person (**Appellant**)
Advocate Hemant Yadav, Counsel along with Mr. Yasir Arafat, Law Officer for NADA. (**Respondent**)

JUDGEMENT DATED : 05.06.2026

I. The present appeal has been filed on behalf of the athlete, Mr. Mohit Rathee, against the Order dated 31-12-2024 passed by the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel (“ADDP”) in Case No. 02/ADDP/2024 (“Impugned Order”). By way of the Impugned Order, the Athlete was declared ineligible for a period of four (4) years with effect from 12-02-2024, i.e., from the date of notification of provisional suspension, on account of violation of Articles 2.1 (Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete’s Sample) and 2.2 (Use or Attempted Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method) of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021 (“Rules”), as the Athlete failed to establish that the Anti-Doping Rule Violation (“ADRV”) was non-intentional within the meaning of Article 10.2.1.1 of the Rules.

II. BRIEF FACTS:

1. The athlete, Mr. Mohit Rathee aged 23 years, participated in the “Pro Kabaddi Season 10” held at Jaipur, Rajasthan. On 12.01.2024, in-competition urine sample was collected from the athlete by the Doping Control Officer of NADA. Thereafter, as per the procedure, the sample Code **6552083** was split into two separate bottles referred as Sample “A-6552083” and Sample “B-6552083”
2. Subsequently, both the “A” and “B” urine samples of the Appellant were sent to the Doping Control Laboratory, New Delhi, a World Anti-Doping Agency (“WADA”) accredited laboratory. The Laboratory analysed the “A” Sample in accordance with the procedures prescribed under WADA’s International Standard for Laboratories. The analysis of the “A” Sample returned an Adverse Analytical Finding (“AAF”) for the following substance:

“Mephentermine and its metabolite, Phentermine (S6 Stimulant).”

3. The analysis of the “A” Sample that revealed the presence of prohibited substances Mephentermine and its metabolite, Phentermine, are under the S6 (Stimulants) category of the WADA Prohibited List and classified as non-specified substances.
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 (“IRSM”) 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 Finding (“AAF”) in the “A” Sample vide notification dated 12-02-2024, whereby he was informed about the presence of the prohibited substance in his sample. The notification further informed the Athlete of the alleged violations of Articles 2.1 and 2.2 of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021, on account of the presence of Mephentermine and its metabolite, Phentermine (S6 Stimulant).
6. In terms of Article 7.4.1 of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021, the Athlete was provisionally suspended with effect from 12-02-2024, i.e., the date of notification of the AAF, pending resolution of the matter. The Athlete did not challenge the Adverse Analytical Finding hence waived his right to the opening and analysis of the “B” Sample.
7. On 26-02-2024, the National Anti-Doping Agency (“NADA”) issued a Notice of Charge (“NOC”) to the Athlete for the alleged violations of Articles 2.1 and 2.2 of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021. Through the said Notice of Charge, the Athlete was informed of the potential consequences of the alleged Anti-Doping Rule Violation (“ADRV”), including the conditions for elimination, reduction, or suspension of the period of ineligibility, as well as the consequences arising from aggravating circumstances, in accordance with the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021.
8. Thereafter, on 23-07-2024, an intimation regarding the constitution of the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel (“ADDP”) to adjudicate the alleged ADRV proceedings against the Athlete in Case No. 02/ADDP/2024 was issued. By way of the said communication, both parties, namely NADA and the Athlete, were granted an opportunity to file their respective written submissions before the Hon’ble ADDP.
9. After hearing both parties, considering the pleadings on record, submissions advanced, documents placed on record, and the oral as well as written arguments, the Hon’ble ADDP reserved the matter for orders. Subsequently, vide the Impugned Order dated 31-12-2024, the Athlete was declared ineligible for a period of four (4) years with effect from 12-02-2024, being the date of notification of provisional suspension, for violation of Articles 2.1 and 2.2 under Article 10.2.1.1 of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021. Aggrieved by the said decision, the Athlete filed the present Appeal before the Anti-Doping Appeal Panel (“ADAP”).
10. On 09-02-2026, notice regarding the constitution of the Anti-Doping Appeal Panel (“ADAP”) and directions to file written submissions was issued to both parties. Pursuant

thereto, the Respondent, i.e., NADA, filed its written submissions before the Panel.

11. The final hearing in the present matter before the ADAP was concluded on 22-04-2026, and after hearing both parties at length, the Panel reserved the matter for orders.

III. APPELLANT'S SUBMISSIONS:

12. The Appellant-Athlete, Mr. Mohit Rathee, has preferred the present Appeal against the decision dated 31.12.2024 passed by the Learned Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel ("Ld. ADDP") in the matter titled NADA v. Mr. Mohit Rathee, whereby the Athlete was sanctioned with a period of ineligibility of four (4) years for the presence of Mephentermine and its metabolite, Phentermine, in his urine sample collected during the Pro Kabaddi League Season-10 on 12.01.2024.
13. The Appellant submitted that he is a professional Kabaddi player representing the State of Haryana at the national level and has maintained an unblemished sporting record throughout his career. It was contended that he had never intentionally consumed any prohibited substance for performance enhancement and has always adhered to the principles of clean sport.
14. That on 12.01.2024, during the course of in-competition testing conducted by the Respondent-NADA, the Athlete provided urine sample no. 6552083, which subsequently tested positive for Mephentermine and its metabolite, Phentermine, classified as a prohibited stimulant under category S6 of the WADA Prohibited List. Thereafter, the Athlete was served with an Adverse Analytical Finding Notification dated 12.02.2024, followed by a Notice of Charge dated 26.02.2024 alleging violation of Articles 2.1 and 2.2 of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021 ("NADR").
15. The Appellant submitted that immediately upon receipt of the Notice of Charge, he personally visited the NADA office on 27.02.2024 and supplied all relevant medical documents in support of his defence. It was further submitted that written submissions were thereafter filed before the Ld. ADDP, and hearings were conducted on 10.10.2024 and 29.10.2024 before the impugned order dated 31.12.2024 came to be passed.
16. Explaining the source of the prohibited substance, the Athlete submitted that after competing in Match No. 64 of the Pro Kabaddi League in Mumbai on 09.01.2024, he travelled to Jaipur on 10.01.2024 and thereafter proceeded to his hometown, Rohtak, to briefly visit his family. It was contended that on 11.01.2024, while assisting his brother on the family farm, he suffered an insect bite on his back, which resulted in severe uneasiness, breathing difficulty, disorientation, and rapid physical deterioration.
17. That owing to his deteriorating medical condition, his family urgently shifted him to Parkash Multispeciality Hospital, Rohtak, where he was examined by Dr. B.K. Bazzad and diagnosed with anaphylactic shock, being a severe and life-threatening allergic reaction. It was contended that, in order to stabilize the Athlete's condition, emergency medical treatment was administered, including Mephentermine through intravenous vasopressor support. The Athlete relied upon the hospital admission register, discharge summary, and prescription records to substantiate the said treatment.
18. It was further submitted that at the relevant time, he was in extreme medical distress and

had no knowledge, awareness, or control regarding the medicines administered by the treating physician. It was contended that he was wholly dependent upon the expertise of qualified medical professionals and had no reason to suspect that the administered medication contained a prohibited substance. According to the Athlete, the presence of Mephentermine in his sample was solely the consequence of emergency medical intervention and not deliberate doping.

19. That the Athlete has successfully discharged the burden of proof on the standard of “balance of probability” by establishing the source of the prohibited substance through contemporaneous documentary evidence, including medical prescriptions, discharge summaries, and hospital admission records.
20. Invoking Article 10.2 of the NADR, the Athlete submitted that the anti-doping rule violation in the present case was clearly non-intentional. The ingestion of Mephentermine occurred only due to emergency treatment administered in a hospital setting during a medical crisis and was wholly unrelated to sport performance, training, or enhancement of competitive ability.
21. That Article 10.2.3 of the NADR defines “intentional” conduct as conduct where an athlete knew that the conduct constituted an anti-doping rule violation or knew of a significant risk and manifestly disregarded such risk. In the present case, the Athlete neither possessed such knowledge nor consciously disregarded any risk, as he was in a vulnerable medical condition requiring urgent treatment. Therefore, the violation cannot be characterized as intentional within the meaning of Article 10.2.3 of the NADR.
22. The counsel for the Athlete further contended that the administration of Mephentermine was undertaken solely for life-saving purposes and had no connection whatsoever with enhancement of sporting performance. Accordingly, the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility of four years deserves to be reduced to two years under Article 10.2.2 of the NADR.
23. Without prejudice to the above, the Athlete prayed for complete elimination of sanction under Article 10.5 of the NADR on the ground of “No Fault or Negligence”. The prohibited substance entered the Athlete’s system solely because of emergency medical intervention administered by a qualified physician while the Athlete was incapable of questioning or controlling the treatment being given to him.
24. Referring to the definition of “No Fault or Negligence” under Appendix-1 of the NADR, the Athlete submitted that he neither knew nor could reasonably have known, even with the exercise of utmost caution, that he had been administered a prohibited substance. It was argued that, given the life-threatening nature of the anaphylactic shock and the Athlete’s compromised medical condition, no reasonable expectation could be placed upon him to verify the composition of medicines being urgently administered in a hospital emergency setting.
25. That he had no role whatsoever in determining the course of treatment and merely relied upon the expertise of licensed medical professionals in a hospital environment. The treatment administered was unavoidable and medically necessary, and the Athlete has fully established the route through which the prohibited substance entered his system.

26. In support of the plea of No Fault or Negligence, reliance has been placed upon the decision rendered in *Stefan Ivanov Vassiliev v. FIBT & BBTF*, wherein the athlete underwent emergency surgery and was administered a prohibited substance during post-operative treatment. The CAS Panel held that the athlete had no control over the medical treatment administered in emergency circumstances and therefore bore no fault or negligence. The Athlete particularly relies upon the observations of the CAS Panel that it cannot reasonably be expected from an athlete suffering from severe pain and a life-threatening condition to comply with ordinary obligations of anti-doping caution.
27. Reliance has also been placed upon *P. v. IIHF*, wherein the athlete was administered a prohibited substance by emergency room doctors after an accident. The CAS Panel held that the athlete, being in severe physical and psychological distress, was unable to influence or control the treatment applied to him and therefore established absence of fault or negligence.
28. On the strength of the aforesaid CAS jurisprudence, the Athlete submitted that the administration of Mephentermine in the present matter was entirely beyond his control, knowledge, and sphere of influence and therefore the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility deserves to be completely eliminated under Article 10.5 of the NADR.
29. In the alternative, the Athlete has sought reduction of sanction under Article 10.6 of the NADR on the ground of “No Significant Fault or Negligence”. Further, even if some degree of fault is attributable to the Athlete, such fault is minimal and insignificant when viewed in the totality of circumstances, particularly considering the medical emergency, absence of intent, reliance upon qualified doctors, and the urgent nature of the treatment.
30. That he acted entirely in good faith by seeking immediate medical assistance and had no reason whatsoever to suspect that the treatment administered to him would contain a prohibited substance. It was contended that his conduct falls at the lowest possible end of the fault spectrum and therefore the sanction ought to be reduced to not more than one year.
31. Reliance in this regard has been placed upon *WADA & USADA v. Eric Thompson*, wherein the CAS Panel observed that factors such as youth and inexperience may be relevant considerations while assessing an athlete’s degree of fault depending upon the circumstances of a particular case.
32. Further reliance has been placed upon *Olga Pestova v. Russian Anti-Doping Agency (RUSADA)*, wherein the CAS observed that the threshold for establishing “No Significant Fault or Negligence” should not be set excessively high and that an athlete cannot reasonably be expected to undertake every conceivable verification measure in all circumstances. The Athlete submitted that the said principles squarely apply to the present case involving urgent medical intervention.
33. The Athlete additionally submitted that he is a young and relatively inexperienced athlete hailing from an extremely humble background and having grown up without parental guidance or adequate anti-doping education, and lacked the sophistication, awareness, and resources necessary to fully appreciate complex anti-doping regulations, which factors further reduce his degree of fault.

34. The Athlete further raised objections to the findings recorded by the Ld. ADDP in the impugned order dated 31.12.2024. The observation of the Ld. ADDP that Mephentermine was not the preferred treatment for anaphylactic shock is wholly irrelevant, since the treatment decision was taken exclusively by a qualified medical practitioner and not by the Athlete. Reliance has again been placed upon the ruling in P. v. IIFH, wherein the CAS held that the correctness of medical diagnosis or treatment standards is immaterial once it is established that the prohibited substance was administered without the athlete's ability to prevent it.
35. The Athlete further contends that the Ld. ADDP failed to properly appreciate crucial documentary evidence, including medical records and the testimony of Dr. B.K. Bazzad, which conclusively established that the prohibited substance entered the Athlete's body solely due to emergency medical treatment. It was submitted that the finding of the Ld. ADDP that the Athlete failed to establish unintentional ingestion was therefore erroneous and unsustainable.
36. The Athlete also objected to the observation of the Ld. ADDP questioning how the Athlete was able to compete the following day. It was submitted that the Athlete was contractually obligated to participate in the league and belonged to a financially constrained background with responsibility to support his family. It was further contended that although the Athlete participated in the match, his medical condition had not fully recovered and he was substituted within the first half itself due to health-related difficulties.
37. On the basis of the aforesaid submissions, the Athlete has prayed that the present Appeal be allowed, the impugned order dated 31.12.2024 be set aside, and the Athlete be exonerated from all sanctions on the basis of No Fault or Negligence under Article 10.5 of the NADR. In the alternative, the Athlete has prayed that the sanction be substantially reduced on the basis of No Significant Fault or Negligence under Article 10.6.2 of the NADR and that the period of ineligibility be restricted to not more than one year, with credit for provisional suspension already undergone and backdating of any sanction from the date of sample collection, i.e., 12-01- 2024.

IV. Written Submissions on Behalf of The Respondent (NADA):

38. The Respondent-National Anti-Doping Agency ("NADA") has filed the present Written Submissions opposing the Appeal preferred by the Appellant-Athlete, Mr. Mohit Rathee, against the final order dated 31.12.2024 passed by the Learned Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel ("Ld. ADDP"), whereby the Athlete was held guilty of Anti-Doping Rule Violations ("ADRVs") and sanctioned with a period of ineligibility of four (4) years.
39. At the outset, the Respondent has raised a preliminary objection with regard to the maintainability of the Appeal on the ground of limitation. It is submitted that under Article 13.2.2 of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021 ("NADR 2021"), an appeal before the Anti-Doping Appeal Panel is required to be filed within twenty-one (21) days from the date of receipt of the impugned decision. According to NADA, the Appellant himself has admitted a delay of twenty-one days in filing the present Appeal in the accompanying application for condonation of delay. It is contended that mere change of legal counsel cannot constitute a compelling or unavoidable circumstance sufficient to

justify extension of the statutory limitation period prescribed under the NADR. Accordingly, it is prayed that the Appeal be dismissed at the threshold as being barred by limitation.

40. On merits, the Respondent submitted that on 12.01.2024, during Season-10 of the Pro Kabaddi League held in Jaipur, Rajasthan, the Appellant-Athlete was subjected to an in-competition doping control test conducted by NADA. The Athlete's urine sample bearing Code No. 6552083 was analyzed at the WADA-accredited National Dope Testing Laboratory ("NDTL"), which returned an Adverse Analytical Finding ("AAF") for Mephentermine and its metabolite, Phentermine. It was submitted that Mephentermine is categorized under Section S6 (Stimulants) of the WADA Prohibited List and is classified as a Non-Specified Substance.
41. The Respondent further submitted that the Athlete admittedly did not possess any Therapeutic Use Exemption ("TUE") authorizing the presence or use of the prohibited substance in his body. It was contended that after considering the evidence and submissions placed before it, the Ld. ADDP rightly concluded that the Athlete had committed ADRVs under the NADR and accordingly imposed a four-year period of ineligibility vide its reasoned order dated 31.12.2024.
42. NADA submitted that the present case is governed by the strict liability principle embodied under Article 2.1.1 of the amended NADR 2021, which imposes a personal duty upon every athlete to ensure that no prohibited substance enters his or her body. It was contended that once a prohibited substance or its metabolites are found in an athlete's sample, an anti-doping rule violation stands established irrespective of intent, fault, negligence, or knowing use.
43. The Respondent further contended that since Mephentermine is a Non-Specified Substance, Article 10.2.1.1 of the NADR 2021 mandates imposition of a four-year period of ineligibility unless the athlete is able to establish, on a balance of probability, that the anti-doping rule violation was not intentional. According to NADA, the Appellant has completely failed to discharge this burden, and the defence sought to be advanced by him is riddled with inconsistencies, improbabilities, and contradictions.
44. The Respondent disputed the veracity and plausibility of the medical emergency projected by the Athlete. The Appellant has claimed that on 11.01.2024 he suffered an insect bite, developed an anaphylactic shock, and was administered Mephentermine intravenously by one Dr. B.K. Bazzad as part of emergency treatment. However, according to NADA, Mephentermine is not a recognized, standard, or preferred treatment for anaphylactic shock, the universally accepted emergency treatment being Epinephrine/Adrenaline. Therefore, the Athlete's explanation lacks medical credibility and reliability.
45. That the medical documents relied upon by the Athlete themselves create serious doubts regarding the genuineness of the alleged medical emergency. It was contended that despite records allegedly showing severe and life-threatening symptoms, including low blood pressure and elevated pulse rate on the afternoon of 11.01.2024, the Athlete was discharged from the hospital within approximately five hours on the same day. NADA further argues that the Athlete thereafter participated in a highly physical professional Kabaddi match on 12.01.2024, i.e., the very next day, which was wholly inconsistent

with the claim of a severe anaphylactic shock. According to the Respondent, these circumstances strongly indicate that the medical defence has been subsequently engineered merely to explain the Adverse Analytical Finding.

46. The Respondent has also emphasized the contents of the Doping Control Form (“DCF”) filled out and signed by the Athlete on 12.01.2024. It was submitted that the Athlete specifically disclosed consumption of “Mobizox Tab, C4 (Pre-Workout), Whey Protein, and Dolo” during the preceding seven days, but failed to disclose any alleged emergency hospitalization, intravenous injections, or administration of Mephentermine and Hydrocortisone. According to NADA, the omission of such a significant medical event occurring merely twenty-four hours prior to sample collection constitutes deliberate suppression of material facts and demonstrates manifest disregard of the risk of an anti-doping rule violation.
47. Therefore, the conduct of the Athlete falls squarely within the ambit of “intentional” conduct under Article 10.2.3 of the NADR 2021, which includes situations where an athlete is aware of a significant risk that his conduct may result in an anti-doping rule violation and manifestly disregards such risk. NADA submits that the Athlete had ample opportunity to disclose the alleged emergency treatment in the DCF but consciously failed to do so, thereby negating any plea of bona fide conduct or good faith.
48. Opposing the Athlete’s plea for elimination or reduction of sanction under Articles 10.5 and 10.6 of the NADR, the Respondent submitted that the Athlete has failed to establish either “No Fault or Negligence” or “No Significant Fault or Negligence” as contemplated under the Rules. The definition of “No Fault or Negligence” requires an athlete to demonstrate that he neither knew nor could reasonably have known, even with the exercise of utmost caution, that a prohibited substance had entered his body.
49. According to the Respondent, the Athlete exercised no degree of caution whatsoever. NADA contended that the Athlete failed to inform the treating doctor that he was a professional athlete subject to anti-doping regulations, failed to verify the contents of the injection allegedly administered to him, and subsequently failed to disclose the same in the Doping Control Form. These omissions, according to the Respondent, clearly establish breach of duty and lack of care appropriate to the circumstances, thereby disentitling the Athlete from any relief under Articles 10.5 or 10.6 of the NADR.
50. The Respondent has further sought to distinguish the CAS jurisprudence relied upon by the Athlete, including *P. v. IIHF*. In those matters, the athletes were incapacitated for prolonged periods in genuine life-or-death situations, whereas in the present case the Appellant was allegedly discharged within a few hours and thereafter participated in a professional sporting event the very next day. According to NADA, the factual matrix of the present case does not satisfy the threshold required for establishing “utmost caution” or absence of fault.
51. On the basis of the aforesaid submissions, the Respondent has prayed that the application for condonation of delay as well as the Appeal itself be dismissed. NADA has further prayed that the decision dated 31.12.2024 passed by the Ld. ADDP be upheld in its entirety, including the imposition of a four-year period of ineligibility commencing from 12.02.2024 and the consequential disqualification of all competitive results obtained by the Athlete from the date of sample collection, i.e., 12.01.2024 onwards, in

accordance with Article 10.10 of the NADR 2021.

V. Observations of ADAP: -

- 52.** This Anti-Doping Appeal Panel (“ADAP”) has carefully considered the pleadings, oral submissions advanced by both parties, documentary material placed on record, the Impugned Order dated 31.12.2024 passed by the Learned Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel (“Ld. ADDP”), and the applicable provisions of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021 (“NADR 2021”).
- 53.** At the outset, it is pertinent to note that the presence of the prohibited substance, namely Mephentermine and its metabolite Phentermine, in the urine sample of the Appellant-Athlete is undisputed. The Athlete neither challenged the Adverse Analytical Finding (“AAF”) nor exercised his right to analysis of the “B” Sample. Consequently, the commission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations (“ADRVs”) under Articles 2.1 and 2.2 of the NADR 2021 stands conclusively established.
- 54.** The substance detected in the Athlete’s sample, namely Mephentermine, falls under Section S6 (Stimulants) of the WADA Prohibited List and is classified as a Non-Specified Substance. In terms of Article 10.2.1.1 of the NADR 2021, the applicable period of ineligibility for presence and use of a Non-Specified Substance is four (4) years unless the athlete establishes, on a balance of probability, that the violation was not intentional.
- 55.** The entire defence of the Athlete rests upon the contention that the prohibited substance entered his body through emergency medical treatment administered on 11.01.2024 after an alleged insect bite which purportedly caused an anaphylactic shock. According to the Athlete, he was admitted to Parkash Multispeciality Hospital, Rohtak, and was administered Mephentermine by Dr. B.K. Bazzad during emergency treatment.
- 56.** However, upon careful scrutiny of the material placed on record, this Panel finds substantial inconsistencies and improbabilities in the explanation furnished by the Athlete.
- 57.** The Panel notes that the Athlete has claimed that he suffered a severe and life-threatening anaphylactic reaction involving breathing difficulty, disorientation, low blood pressure, and rapid physical deterioration. However, the medical records relied upon by the Athlete themselves indicate that he was discharged from the hospital within a few hours on the very same day.
- 58.** More importantly, despite allegedly suffering a severe medical emergency on 11.01.2024, the Athlete admittedly participated in a highly strenuous professional Kabaddi match on 12.01.2024, i.e., the very next day. Such conduct appears wholly inconsistent with the case of a serious anaphylactic shock requiring emergency vasopressor intervention.
- 59.** This Panel finds merit in the submission advanced by the Respondent-NADA that the medical defence projected by the Athlete lacks overall credibility and appears improbable in the factual circumstances of the present case.

- 60.** The Panel further notes that Mephentermine is not recognized as the standard or preferred line of emergency treatment for anaphylactic shock. The accepted first-line treatment for anaphylaxis is Epinephrine/Adrenaline. Although this Panel does not sit in appeal over medical protocols adopted by physicians, the nature of the treatment administered nevertheless becomes a relevant surrounding circumstance while assessing the plausibility of the Athlete's explanation.
- 61.** Significantly, the Athlete failed to disclose the alleged emergency hospitalization, injections, or administration of Mephentermine in the Doping Control Form ("DCF") filled and signed by him during sample collection on 12.01.2024.
- 62.** The omission becomes particularly serious because the Athlete admittedly disclosed other substances and medications consumed during the preceding seven days, including Mobizox tablets, C4 pre-workout, whey protein, and Dolo tablets. Therefore, the Athlete was fully conscious of his obligation to disclose medications and supplements consumed prior to testing.
- 63.** The alleged hospitalization and administration of injections had purportedly occurred less than twenty-four hours prior to sample collection. Yet, no mention whatsoever was made by the Athlete in the DCF regarding the same. In the considered opinion of this Panel, such omission cannot be brushed aside as inadvertent or insignificant.
- 64.** Under the anti-doping framework, athletes bear a strict and personal responsibility to ensure transparency regarding all substances entering their bodies. The DCF serves as a crucial safeguard within the anti-doping regime, and deliberate or reckless omission of material medical treatment significantly undermines the credibility of the defence subsequently advanced.
- 65.** This Panel is further of the opinion that the Athlete failed to exercise even the minimum degree of caution expected from a professional athlete competing at the national level. There is no evidence on record to show that the Athlete informed the treating doctor that he was a professional athlete governed by anti-doping regulations. There is equally no evidence that he attempted to verify the nature of the medicines administered to him despite allegedly receiving injectable treatment immediately prior to competition.
- 66.** The strict liability principle embodied under Article 2.1.1 of the NADR 2021 imposes a personal duty upon every athlete to ensure that no prohibited substance enters his or her body. The said principle has repeatedly been affirmed in anti-doping jurisprudence including CAS 94/129 Quigley v. UIT, wherein the CAS emphasized that athletes are solely responsible for substances found in their systems irrespective of intent or negligence.
- 67.** The Athlete has heavily relied upon decisions such as P. v. IIHF and Stefan Ivanov Vassiliev v. FIBT & BBTF. However, this Panel finds the said decisions clearly distinguishable on facts.
- 68.** In those matters, the athletes were placed in genuine and prolonged emergency situations involving severe incapacity, surgeries, or circumstances where they had virtually no control over the treatment being administered. In contrast, in the present case, the Athlete was allegedly discharged within a few hours and thereafter participated

in a professional sporting event the very next day.

69. The factual matrix of the present case therefore does not satisfy the threshold contemplated in CAS jurisprudence for establishing either “No Fault or Negligence” or even sufficiently mitigating circumstances warranting substantial reduction of sanction.
70. The Panel further observes that the burden of proving lack of intention squarely lies upon the Athlete under Article 10.2.1.1 of the NADR 2021. Mere production of medical papers does not automatically discharge such burden, particularly where the surrounding circumstances generate substantial doubt regarding the genuineness, credibility, and completeness of the explanation offered.
71. This Panel is unable to ignore the cumulative effect of the following circumstances:
 - i. non-disclosure of alleged hospitalization and injections in the DCF;
 - ii. participation in a professional Kabaddi match immediately after the alleged severe medical emergency;
 - iii. absence of evidence showing disclosure to the treating doctor regarding anti-doping obligations;
 - iv. lack of independent corroborative evidence supporting the seriousness of the alleged anaphylactic shock; and
 - v. inconsistencies surrounding the nature of treatment administered.
72. Taken cumulatively, these circumstances materially weaken the defence advanced by the Athlete and prevent this Panel from accepting the contention that the Athlete has successfully established absence of intention on a balance of probability.

VI. FINDINGS

73. In view of the foregoing observations, this Panel holds that the Athlete has failed to discharge the burden cast upon him under Article 10.2.1.1 of the NADR 2021 to establish that the Anti-Doping Rule Violation was “not intentional.”
74. The explanation advanced by the Athlete regarding emergency medical administration of Mephentermine does not inspire sufficient confidence to displace the statutory presumption applicable in cases involving Non-Specified Substances.
75. This Panel further holds that the conduct of the Athlete, particularly the failure to disclose the alleged hospitalization and injections in the Doping Control Form, demonstrates at minimum a manifest disregard of the significant risk of committing an anti-doping rule violation within the meaning of Article 10.2.3 of the NADR 2021.
76. Accordingly, the Athlete is not entitled to reduction of sanction under Article 10.2.2 of the NADR 2021.
77. This Panel further finds that the Athlete has failed to establish the stringent requirements necessary for elimination of sanction under Article 10.5 on the ground of “No Fault or Negligence.”
78. Equally, the Athlete has failed to establish circumstances sufficient to invoke Article

10.6 relating to “No Significant Fault or Negligence,” particularly in view of the material omissions, inconsistencies, and lack of due diligence evident from the record.

79. The findings recorded by the Learned Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel in the Impugned Order dated 31.12.2024 are well-reasoned, legally sustainable, and supported by the material available on record.
80. This Panel therefore finds no infirmity, illegality, perversity, or procedural irregularity warranting interference with the Impugned Order passed by the Ld. ADDP.

VII. DECISION

81. The Impugned Order dated 31.12.2024 passed by the Learned Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel in Case No. 02/ADDP/2024 is affirmed by this panel.
82. The period of ineligibility of four (4) years imposed upon the Athlete for violation of Articles 2.1 and 2.2 of the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021 shall remain operative with effect from 12.02.2024, being the date of imposition of provisional suspension.
83. The Athlete shall continue to receive credit for the period of provisional suspension already undergone in terms of Article 10.13 of the NADR 2021.
84. Further, in accordance with Article 10.10 of the NADR 2021, all competitive results obtained by the Athlete from the date of sample collection, i.e., 12.01.2024 onwards, including forfeiture of medals, titles, ranking points, prizes, and other consequential benefits, shall remain disqualified.
85. Consequently, the present Appeal filed by the Appellant-Athlete, Mr. Mohit Rathee, being devoid of merit, is hereby dismissed.

RANI Digitally signed
by RANI
Date: 2026.06.05
18:06:08 +05'30'
Rani Rampal
(Sports Member)

Rana
Kanganda
a
Chengappa
pa
Dr. Rana Chengappa
(Medical Member)

Digitally signed
by Rana
Kanganda
Chengappa
Date:
2026.06.06
10:32:13 +05'30'


Ms. Geetanjali Sharma
(Chairman)