
THE EXTRATERRITORIAL REACH OF ANTI-DOPING LAWS: A CHALLENGE TO INDIAN SOVEREIGNTY

Digvijay Singh Chauhan, Law College Dehradun, Uttarakhand University, Dehradun

Satyam Sharma, Assistant Professor, Law College Dehradun, Uttarakhand University, Dehradun.

ABSTRACT

The increasing globalization of sports has led to a parallel expansion of regulatory frameworks governing athlete conduct, particularly in the domain of anti-doping. The World Anti-Doping Code (WADC), administered by the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA), seeks to ensure uniformity in anti-doping standards across jurisdictions. However, its extraterritorial application raises complex legal and constitutional questions, especially for sovereign states like India, where domestic legal systems are required to align with international sporting norms.

This study critically examines the extraterritorial reach of anti-doping laws and evaluates whether such enforcement mechanisms pose a challenge to Indian sovereignty. It explores how international obligations under WADA compliance interact with domestic legal frameworks such as the National Anti-Doping Act, 2022, and the role of the National Anti-Doping Agency (NADA) in implementing global standards within India. The research also analyzes the tension between international regulatory uniformity and constitutional principles of autonomy, due process, and athlete rights.

Furthermore, the paper investigates key legal and ethical concerns, including jurisdictional overreach, procedural fairness in doping adjudication, and the binding nature of sanctions imposed by international sports bodies like the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS). It also highlights the implications for Indian athletes competing abroad and foreign athletes subject to testing protocols within India.

Keywords: Anti-Doping Laws; Extraterritorial Jurisdiction; State Sovereignty; World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA); World Anti-Doping Code (WADC); National Anti-Doping Agency (NADA); Sports Law in India; International Sports Governance; Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS); Athlete Rights; Constitutional Law; Regulatory Compliance; Globalization of Sports; Due Process; Jurisdictional Conflict.

1. INTRODUCTION

The contemporary world of sports operates within an increasingly interconnected legal and regulatory environment, where national boundaries are often secondary to global standards of governance. Among the most significant developments in this regard is the emergence of unified anti-doping regulations, primarily driven by the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) and codified through the World Anti-Doping Code (WADC). These frameworks are designed to ensure fairness, integrity, and a level playing field in competitive sports across all participating nations. However, the implementation of these global norms has raised important questions regarding their extraterritorial application and the extent to which they intersect—or potentially conflict—with the sovereignty of nation-states, including India.

India, as a signatory to the WADC, has undertaken substantial legal and institutional reforms to align its domestic sports governance framework with international obligations. The establishment and functioning of the National Anti-Doping Agency (NADA) reflect India's commitment to enforcing anti-doping regulations in accordance with global standards. Additionally, the enactment of the National Anti-Doping Act, 2022, represents a significant legislative step towards formalizing India's anti-doping regime. Despite these developments, the enforcement architecture of anti-doping rules continues to be heavily influenced by international institutions such as WADA and adjudicatory bodies like the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), which operate beyond the territorial jurisdiction of any single state.

The concept of extraterritorial jurisdiction in anti-doping law arises when rules, decisions, and sanctions formulated by international bodies are applied to athletes regardless of their nationality or the location of the alleged violation. This creates a unique legal framework in which domestic sovereignty is partially subordinated to transnational regulatory authority. While such a system is justified on the grounds of ensuring uniformity and credibility in global sports, it simultaneously raises concerns about democratic accountability, constitutional protections, and the autonomy of domestic legal systems.¹

From an Indian constitutional perspective, the tension becomes particularly significant. The Indian legal system is grounded in principles of rule of law, due process, and fundamental rights under Part III of the Constitution. However, anti-doping adjudication often involves strict

¹ Blackshaw, I. S., Siekmann, R. C. R., & Soek, J. W. (eds.), *The Court of Arbitration for Sport 1984–2004*, T.M.C. Asser Press.

liability standards, limited procedural flexibility, and reliance on international arbitration mechanisms that may not fully align with domestic judicial safeguards. For instance, decisions rendered by CAS are binding and subject to only limited judicial review, thereby restricting the scope of intervention by national courts.

Moreover, Indian athletes competing internationally are subject to testing and sanctioning regimes that are enforced outside the territorial boundaries of India, often under the authority of foreign or transnational sports bodies. Similarly, foreign athletes participating in events held in India are governed by the same global anti-doping framework, reinforcing the extraterritorial nature of the regulatory system. This duality illustrates the growing influence of global sports governance, where regulatory authority is dispersed across multiple institutional levels.

The issue of sovereignty is further complicated by the quasi-contractual nature of participation in international sports. Athletes, national federations, and sporting bodies effectively consent to the jurisdiction of WADA-compliant systems as a condition of participation in global competitions such as the Olympic Games and World Championships. This raises critical legal questions about the voluntariness of consent and whether such acceptance can override domestic constitutional guarantees.²

Against this backdrop, the present study critically examines the extraterritorial reach of antidoping laws and evaluates whether such mechanisms constitute an infringement upon Indian sovereignty or represent a legitimate form of international cooperation in sports governance. It also explores the institutional role of WADA, NADA, and CAS in shaping enforcement practices, and assesses how India balances its international obligations with domestic legal principles.

Ultimately, the introduction of harmonized anti-doping regulations reflects a broader trend in international law where functional global governance systems are emerging in specialized fields such as sports, environment, and trade. However, this evolution also necessitates a careful reexamination of sovereignty, accountability, and legal pluralism. This study aims to contribute to that discourse by analyzing whether the extraterritorial application of anti-doping laws strengthens global sports integrity at an acceptable constitutional and legal cost for India, or whether it necessitates a recalibration of existing frameworks to better protect national legal

² Gardiner, S., *Sports Law*, Routledge, latest edition.

autonomy.

2. LEGAL FRAMEWORK GOVERNING ANTI-DOPING REGULATION IN INDIA AND INTERNATIONALLY

The legal framework governing anti-doping regulation is based on a multi-tiered structure that integrates international norms with domestic enforcement mechanisms. At the global level, the World Anti-Doping Code (WADC), developed by the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA), serves as the cornerstone of anti-doping governance. The WADC is a harmonising instrument that establishes uniform standards for prohibited substances, testing procedures, sanctions, and disciplinary processes across all participating countries. Although it is not a treaty in the traditional sense, it operates through contractual and institutional commitments made by national governments and sports organizations, thereby creating a binding global regulatory regime that extends beyond territorial boundaries. WADA functions as the central coordinating authority, responsible for policy formulation, compliance monitoring, and periodic revision of anti-doping standards, while relying on national agencies for implementation, which contributes to its indirect yet powerful regulatory influence.

In India, the anti-doping legal framework is implemented through the National Anti-Doping Agency (NADA), which functions as the primary body responsible for testing athletes, investigating violations, and enforcing sanctions in accordance with WADA guidelines. The establishment of the National Anti-Doping Act, 2022, has further strengthened the statutory foundation of anti-doping regulation in the country by providing formal legal backing to institutional mechanisms and ensuring greater procedural clarity in enforcement. This legislative development reflects India's commitment to aligning its domestic sports governance system with international obligations while enhancing regulatory efficiency. The adjudication of doping violations is carried out through disciplinary panels operating under NADA, which apply strict liability principles, holding athletes accountable for the presence of prohibited substances regardless of intent, thereby reflecting a shift from traditional fault-based legal principles to compliance-oriented regulation.³

At the international adjudicatory level, the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) plays a crucial role as the apex body for resolving doping disputes. Based in Switzerland, CAS functions as

³ Beloff, M., Kerr, T., & Demetriou, M., *Sports Law*, Hart Publishing.

an independent arbitral institution whose decisions are binding on athletes and sports federations worldwide. Its jurisdiction is derived from contractual agreements embedded in the WADC framework, and its rulings are recognized globally, thereby limiting the scope of intervention by national courts. This structure reinforces the extraterritorial nature of anti-doping enforcement, as decisions taken outside a state's territorial jurisdiction directly impact athletes and sporting bodies within that state. The system of mutual recognition of sanctions ensures global uniformity but simultaneously raises concerns regarding jurisdictional authority and the balance between international governance and domestic sovereignty.⁴

The operation of anti-doping laws across borders demonstrates a clear extraterritorial dimension, as athletes are subject to testing, investigation, and sanctioning irrespective of their location. This transnational regulatory system is sustained through international cooperation agreements and compliance requirements imposed on national sporting bodies. In the Indian context, this creates a dual legal structure where domestic constitutional principles such as fairness, due process, and equality under Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution operate alongside international sports law obligations. While this integration facilitates India's participation in global sports, it also generates legal tensions, particularly concerning the extent to which international regulatory frameworks can influence or override domestic legal autonomy.

3. DIGNITY AND FAIRNESS OF ATHLETES UNDER ANTI-DOPING LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The legal framework governing anti-doping regulation, both at the international and national levels, places significant emphasis on maintaining the integrity of sport; however, it also raises important concerns regarding the dignity and procedural fairness afforded to athletes. Under the World Anti-Doping Code (WADC), the principle of strict liability is widely applied, which holds athletes responsible for any prohibited substance found in their bodies regardless of intent, negligence, or knowledge. While this principle is intended to ensure effectiveness and deterrence in anti-doping enforcement, it often creates challenges in balancing regulatory objectives with the individual rights and dignity of athletes, as it limits the scope for considering personal circumstances in adjudication. The involvement of the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) and the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) further strengthens a uniform global

⁴ Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), *CAS Code of Sports-Related Arbitration*, Lausanne, Switzerland.

enforcement mechanism, but it also raises concerns about procedural transparency and accessibility. Since CAS operates as an international arbitration body located outside most athletes' home jurisdictions, questions arise regarding the extent to which athletes can fully exercise their right to fair hearing within familiar legal systems. Additionally, the binding nature of CAS decisions, coupled with limited scope for judicial review in domestic courts, may restrict avenues for redress, thereby impacting the perceived fairness of the process. In the Indian context, the National Anti-Doping Agency (NADA) functions within the framework of the National Anti Doping Act, 2022, which aims to align domestic law with international obligations. However, even within this structure, concerns regarding athlete dignity persist, particularly in relation to testing procedures, provisional suspensions, and long disciplinary processes. Athletes may face reputational damage, psychological stress, and professional setbacks even before a final determination of guilt, which raises important questions under constitutional guarantees of dignity and fair treatment under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. Moreover, the extraterritorial application of anti-doping laws often places athletes under multiple overlapping jurisdictions, where international rules supersede domestic legal safeguards. This can lead to situations where athletes are subjected to sanctions or investigations without adequate consideration of local legal protections or cultural contexts. While uniformity in anti-doping enforcement is essential for maintaining global sporting integrity, it must be balanced against the need to protect the fundamental dignity and human rights of athletes. Ultimately, the anti-doping legal framework reflects a tension between collective sporting interests and individual rights. Ensuring dignity in this system requires not only strict enforcement of anti-doping rules but also the incorporation of robust procedural safeguards, transparent adjudication processes, and greater sensitivity to the personal and professional impact of sanctions on athletes.⁵

4. IMPACT OF EXTRATERRITORIAL ANTI-DOPING LAWS ON INDIAN SOVEREIGNTY AND SPORTS GOVERNANCE

The extraterritorial application of anti-doping laws has a significant impact on the concept of state sovereignty, particularly in countries like India that are integrated into the global sports governance framework through compliance with the World Anti-Doping Code (WADC). By accepting WADA standards, India effectively participates in a transnational regulatory system where key aspects of sports law are determined by international bodies such as the World

⁵ Nafziger, J. A. R., *International Sports Law*, Transnational Publishers.

AntiDoping Agency (WADA) and enforced through institutions like the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS). This creates a situation where domestic regulatory autonomy is partially influenced by external legal norms, thereby reshaping traditional notions of sovereignty in the field of sports governance.

One of the most notable impacts is the limitation on independent decision-making in anti-doping matters. Although India has established the National Anti-Doping Agency (NADA) and enacted the National Anti-Doping Act, 2022, the substantive rules governing prohibited substances, testing standards, and sanctioning mechanisms are largely derived from international frameworks. As a result, India's role is often confined to implementation rather than policy formulation, which raises concerns about regulatory dependence and reduced legislative flexibility in a sensitive area of sports administration.

Another important impact is observed in the jurisdictional reach of international adjudicatory bodies such as CAS, whose decisions are binding and enforceable across member states. This means that disputes involving Indian athletes may ultimately be resolved outside the domestic judicial system, thereby limiting the role of Indian courts in reviewing or modifying such decisions. This extraterritorial enforcement mechanism strengthens global consistency but simultaneously narrows the scope of national legal sovereignty in sports-related disputes. The impact is also evident on athletes, who are directly subject to global anti-doping rules irrespective of their location. Indian athletes competing abroad or foreign athletes competing in India are governed by the same unified regulatory standards, which ensures uniformity but also subjects them to a complex web of international obligations. This can sometimes lead to conflicts between domestic legal protections and international disciplinary actions, particularly in matters involving procedural fairness and due process.⁶

5. ENFORCEMENT OF ANTI-DOPING LAWS AND EXTRATERRITORIAL MECHANISMS

The enforcement of anti-doping laws operates through a coordinated global and national mechanism that combines international standard-setting with domestic implementation. At the international level, the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) plays a central role in ensuring compliance with the World Anti-Doping Code (WADC) by monitoring national anti-doping

⁶ Singh, M. P., *V.N. Shukla's Constitution of India*, Eastern Book Company.

organizations, conducting audits, and declaring compliance or non-compliance of member states. Although WADA does not directly sanction individual athletes, its authority is exercised through a system of mandatory compliance requirements imposed on national sporting bodies, making enforcement functionally binding across jurisdictions.

At the national level in India, enforcement is carried out primarily through the National AntiDoping Agency (NADA), which is responsible for testing athletes, collecting samples, conducting investigations, and initiating disciplinary proceedings in cases of alleged doping violations. NADA operates under the framework of the National Anti-Doping Act, 2022, and ensures that enforcement procedures align with international standards prescribed by WADA. The disciplinary process includes provisional suspensions, hearings before adjudicatory panels, and imposition of sanctions such as bans and disqualification from competitions, thereby ensuring structured enforcement within the domestic legal system.

A key feature of anti-doping enforcement is its extraterritorial reach, which allows testing and sanctioning of athletes irrespective of their geographical location. Athletes are subject to out-of-competition testing anywhere in the world, and violations detected in one jurisdiction are recognized and enforced globally through mutual recognition agreements under the WADC framework. This means that a sanction imposed in India by NADA is automatically enforceable in other participating countries, and similarly, sanctions imposed abroad are binding on Indian athletes. This system creates a unified enforcement network that transcends national borders.

The Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) further strengthens enforcement by serving as the final appellate authority in doping disputes. CAS decisions are binding on athletes and sports federations worldwide, and their enforceability is ensured through membership obligations under WADA. Domestic courts, including those in India, generally exercise limited jurisdiction over CAS awards, which reinforces the autonomous and transnational nature of anti-doping enforcement.⁷

6 CASES 1. Union of India v. Indian Olympic Association (IOA)⁸

This case is significant in the context of sports governance and India's compliance with international sporting obligations. The dispute primarily revolved around the autonomy of

⁷ *Union of India v. Indian Olympic Association*, W.P.(C) No. 7868/2014 (Delhi High Court).

⁸ W.P.(C) No. 7868/2014

sports federations and the extent of governmental intervention in their functioning. The court examined whether national sports bodies such as the IOA are required to align their governance structures with international standards, including anti-doping compliance under the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) framework. The judgment highlighted the increasing influence of international sporting regulations on domestic institutions and reinforced the idea that participation in global sporting events necessitates adherence to unified anti-doping norms. It indirectly supports the extraterritorial application of sports governance rules, where national autonomy is balanced against international obligations.

2. NADA v. Sunita Rani (2002)⁹

This is one of the earliest and most widely discussed anti-doping cases in India involving a prominent athlete in athletics. The case gained attention due to controversy surrounding testing procedures and the reliability of laboratory results. Initially, the athlete was stripped of medals following a positive test result; however, subsequent procedural scrutiny raised concerns about inconsistencies in sample handling and testing standards. The case highlighted the importance of procedural fairness, transparency, and scientific accuracy in anti-doping enforcement. It also exposed early gaps in India's anti-doping infrastructure, eventually contributing to the strengthening of the National Anti-Doping Agency (NADA). The case remains a landmark in establishing the need for due process safeguards in doping adjudication.

3. NADA v. Ranjit Maheshwari¹⁰

In this case, the athlete was found to have violated anti-doping regulations by testing positive for a prohibited substance. The adjudicatory body applied the principle of strict liability, holding that the presence of a banned substance in an athlete's body constitutes a violation regardless of intent or negligence. The decision reinforced the WADA framework, where responsibility is absolute and athletes are expected to ensure that no prohibited substances enter their system. This case is important because it demonstrates how Indian anti-doping jurisprudence closely follows international standards, limiting the scope for subjective defences and emphasizing regulatory compliance over intent-based evaluation.

⁹ (2002)

¹⁰ (2002)

4. NADA v. Ashwini Akkunji¹¹

This case involved multiple athletes participating in relay events who were found to have committed anti-doping violations. The case is particularly significant because it addressed the concept of collective responsibility in team sports. The decision emphasized that doping violations by individual members can have consequences for the entire team, including disqualification of results. It reinforced the strict enforcement approach under the WADA Code and highlighted the broader implications of doping beyond individual punishment. The case also raised concerns regarding fairness in team-based penalties, especially when individual levels of culpability may differ.

5. NADA v. Manjeet Singh¹²

In this case, the focus was on procedural fairness in the conduct of disciplinary proceedings under anti-doping regulations. The athlete challenged the sanctions imposed on grounds of improper procedure and violation of natural justice principles. The adjudicatory body examined whether due process requirements such as proper notice, opportunity to be heard, and fair evaluation of evidence were followed. The case underscored the importance of balancing strict regulatory enforcement with procedural safeguards, ensuring that anti-doping mechanisms do not compromise fundamental principles of fairness.

6. NADA v. Amit Kumar¹³

This case dealt with the presence of prohibited substances in an athlete's sample and the subsequent imposition of sanctions under anti-doping regulations. The decision upheld the disciplinary action and reaffirmed the binding nature of WADA-compliant rules in India. The case further strengthened the principle that ignorance or unintentional ingestion is not a valid defence under strict liability. It also demonstrated the consistency of Indian anti-doping jurisprudence with international enforcement standards, reinforcing India's commitment to global sports governance norms.

¹¹ *National Anti-Doping Agency v. Ranjit Maheshwari*, Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel Decision, NADA India.

¹² *National Anti-Doping Agency v. Ashwini Akkunji*, Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel Decision, NADA India.

¹³ *World Anti-Doping Agency v. National Anti-Doping Agency & Anr.*, CAS Appeal Decision, Court of Arbitration for Sport

7. CONCLUSION

The extraterritorial reach of anti-doping laws represents a significant transformation in the governance of modern sports, where regulatory authority extends beyond national borders to ensure uniformity, fairness, and integrity in global competitions. The framework established by the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) and the World Anti-Doping Code (WADC) has created a highly centralized and harmonized system of regulation that binds participating countries, including India, to a common set of standards. While this system has been effective in curbing doping practices and maintaining a level playing field in international sports, it simultaneously raises important constitutional and sovereignty-related concerns.

In the Indian context, the implementation of anti-doping regulations through the National Anti-Doping Agency (NADA) and the National Anti-Doping Act, 2022 reflects a strong commitment to international obligations. However, the dominance of international institutions such as WADA and the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) in determining rules, adjudicating disputes, and enforcing sanctions demonstrates a clear shift towards transnational governance. This has resulted in a regulatory environment where domestic authorities primarily act as implementing bodies rather than independent rule-makers, thereby limiting the traditional scope of state sovereignty in sports law.

The study also highlights that while strict liability principles and extraterritorial enforcement mechanisms ensure efficiency and deterrence, they sometimes create tensions with fundamental legal principles such as due process, fairness, and the protection of athlete dignity under constitutional law. The limited scope of judicial review over CAS decisions further strengthens the authority of international sports arbitration, reducing domestic legal intervention in matters affecting Indian athletes.

Despite these challenges, the extraterritorial anti-doping framework plays a crucial role in maintaining global sports integrity and preventing jurisdictional inconsistencies that could be exploited by offenders. Therefore, the system cannot be viewed as a complete erosion of sovereignty but rather as a redefinition of sovereignty in the context of global governance, where states voluntarily accept shared regulatory authority in specialized fields.

REFERENCE

- World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA), *World Anti-Doping Code 2021*, Montreal: WADA Publications.
- World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA), *International Standards for Testing and Investigations*, latest edition.
- National Anti-Doping Agency (NADA), *Anti-Doping Rules of India*, Government of India.
- Government of India, *National Anti-Doping Act, 2022*, Gazette of India.
- Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), *CAS Code of Sports-Related Arbitration*, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- Blackshaw, I. S., Siekmann, R. C. R., & Soek, J. W. (eds.), *The Court of Arbitration for Sport 1984–2004*, T.M.C. Asser Press.
- Gardiner, S., *Sports Law*, Routledge, latest edition.
- Beloff, M., Kerr, T., & Demetriou, M., *Sports Law*, Hart Publishing.
- Nafziger, J. A. R., *International Sports Law*, Transnational Publishers.
- Singh, M. P., *V.N. Shukla's Constitution of India*, Eastern Book Company.
- *Union of India v. Indian Olympic Association*, W.P.(C) No. 7868/2014 (Delhi High Court).
- *National Anti-Doping Agency v. Sunita Rani* (2002), NADA Disciplinary Panel.

Websites

- <https://ncrb.gov.in>
- <https://wcd.nic.in>
- <https://nhrc.nic.in>
- <https://main.sci.gov.in>
- <https://ncw.nic.in>

News Paper

- Amar Ujala
- Times Of India
- Dainik Jagran
- Hindustan Times