

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: 09.03.2026

Ms. Monisha K,
Sports- Boxing,
D/o Sh. Kuppan,
R/o 3/5 Karpaga Kanniamman Koil,
2nd Street, Triple Lane, Chennai - 600005
Email- anandanand55842@gmail.com

Subj: Decision of the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel Case No.- 115/ADDP/2024.

NADA VS. Ms. Monisha K. (ADAMS ID – K.MOFA68199)

The order containing the decision of the Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel dated 06.03.2026 in respect of the final hearing of the above case held on 27.02.2026 is enclosed.

Please note that according to Articles 2.1 & 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: 06 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. Sports Development Authority of Tamil Nadu, Jawaharlal Nehru Stadium, Raja Muthiah Road, Periyamet, Chennai- 600003, Tamil Nadu, India.
3. The Secretary General, Boxing Federation of India 3rd, PhaseIII, Udyog Vihar, Sector 20, Gurugram, Haryana – 122016.
4. International Boxing Federation, 899 Mountain Ave, Suite 2E Springfield, NJ 07081.

BEFORE THE ANTI-DOPING DISCIPLINARY PANEL

In the matter of Ms. Monisha K. for the violation of Articles 2.1 & 2.2 of

National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021

Case No. 115/ADDP/2024

(PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED THROUGH VIRTUAL MODE)

Quorum: *Mr. Rupinder Pal Singh, Chairperson*
 Dr. Vikaas Sharma, Medical Member
 Ms. Deepali Deshpande, Sports Member

Present: *Mr. Prateek Dhanda with Mr. Yasir Arafat, Law Officer for NADA*
 Ms. Monisha K. along with her sister

JUDGMENT DATED 06.03.2026

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). 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 Ms. Monisha K. 18 years of age, “Boxing | 57-60 Kg”.

B. That the brief facts of the case are as follows:

1. That on 18.10.2024, during the event of ‘**CM Trophy 2024 Championship**’ held at Chennai, Tamil Nadu, 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 1493017** (the "A sample") and **B 1493017** (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:

- ***S5. Diuretics and Masking Agents/ Furosemide***

The above-mentioned substances are listed under **S5** of the WADA's 2024 Prohibited List, being a *specified substance*.

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 "**Diuretics and Masking Agents**" are banned irrespective of the route of ingestion.

4. The athlete was notified of the adverse analytical findings in sample **no. 1493017** via a notification dated 26.11.2024, whereby the athlete was informed about the AAF in his sample reports. 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 athlete was subsequently served with a Notice of Charge, bearing **No. K/6/2023-SPO**, dated 23.01.2025. This Notice of Charge, issued under the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021, accused the athlete of violating **Rule 2.1** and **Rule 2.2**.
7. The Athlete was notified through a letter dated 11.09.2025 that a Hearing Panel has been constituted to address the alleged anti-doping rule violation. The notification informed the Athlete of her 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.
8. The Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel conducted a virtual hearing on 12.12.2025; however, the Athlete did not appear before the Panel. The matter was subsequently listed for a further hearing on 24.12.2025, but the Athlete again failed to appear. In the interest of natural justice, the Athlete was afforded one more opportunity to participate in the proceedings. During the disciplinary hearing held on 27.02.2026, both parties were present, and after hearing the submissions, the Panel reserved its judgment.

C. SUBMISSIONS MADE BY THE ATHLETE ARE REPRODUCED HEREIN:

1. In the present case, upon examining the Athlete, it is noted that she is not educated and comes from a humble rural background. She is also not well-versed in English and was not aware of the anti-doping rules and regulations.
2. The athlete submitted before the panel that she had taken medication to alleviate pain in her back and that the purpose of taking such medication was not to enhance her sporting performance. She did not know that the medicines might have caused adverse report in her sample.

D. 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 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.
2. The athlete is expected to exercise utmost care while taking any medicines/supplement and simply cannot shift her burden to anyone.
3. The Athlete did not disclose any medication on the Doping Control Form at the time of sample collection. Further, she has not produced any medical prescription or supporting document to substantiate her claim of consuming medication.
4. The athlete used a diuretic while participating in the boxing competition. Diuretics are prohibited substances as they may be used to mask the presence of other prohibited substances or to rapidly reduce body weight in weight-category sports such as boxing. Therefore, the use of a diuretic during competition raises a strong possibility of intentional doping and must be viewed seriously under the anti-doping rules.

E. OBSERVATION OF THE ADDP

1. The Panel has carefully considered the submissions of both parties and reviewed the available material.
2. The Athlete's claim of consuming medication solely for pain relief is uncorroborated, as no medical documentation was provided.
3. The Panel finds that the Athlete failed to exercise the degree of care and diligence expected under the National Anti-Doping Rules, 2021, constituting an Anti-Doping Rule Violation. Lack of awareness of the anti-doping rules cannot be accepted as a valid ground for relief.

4. In view of the above facts taken as a whole, it is established that a violation under Article 2.1 of the Anti-Doping Rules has taken place. Once a violation of anti-doping rules has been established, Sanctions on Individuals as provided under Article 10 of the Anti-Doping Rules 2021 must ensue. The present case involves a specified substance and as per Article 10.2.2, the ineligibility period of 2 years.
5. Where the anti-doping rule violation involves a Specified Substance, and the Athlete or other Person can establish No Significant Fault or Negligence, then the period of Ineligibility shall be, at a minimum, a reprimand and no period of Ineligibility, and at a maximum two years of Ineligibility, depending on the Athlete's or other Person's degree of Fault". To claim the benefit of No Significant Fault or Negligence, the Athlete is required to establish the origin of the prohibited substance on the balance of probability, and the burden of proof lies entirely upon the Athlete.
6. In the present case, the Athlete claimed that she consumed the medication only for pain relief, which cannot absolve her from anti-doping responsibility. However, this claim remains uncorroborated as no medical prescription or supporting medical documents were produced. It is well established in the jurisprudence of the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) that an injury or medical condition cannot by itself serve as a valid excuse to escape liability for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation. Nevertheless, considering the overall circumstances of the case, including the Athlete's background, lack of education, and absence of any evidence suggesting intentional use of a prohibited substance to enhance performance. Therefore, a period of ineligibility of two (2) years would be appropriate in the present matter.

F. 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 and the Athlete is liable for sanctions under Article 10.2.2 and liable for ineligibility for 2

years, the Panel accordingly holds that the Athlete's period of his ineligibility for 2 years shall commence from the date of the judgment, i.e., 06.03.2026.

G. 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, 26.11.2024, shall stand disqualified, with all resulting consequences, including forfeiture of medals, points, and prizes.



Mr. Rupinder Pal Singh
(Chairperson)



Dr. Vikas Sharma
(Medical Member)



Ms. Deepali Deshpande
(Sports Member)