

**INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE**

**IOC DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION**

**DECISION**

**REGARDING OLHA KOROBKA  
BORN ON 7 DECEMBER 1985, UKRAINE, ATHLETE, WEIGHTLIFTING**

(Rule 59.2.1 of the Olympic Charter)

Pursuant to the Olympic Charter and, in particular, Rule 59.2.1 thereof, and pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXIX Olympiad in Beijing in 2008 (the “**Rules**”) and, in particular but without limitation, Articles 2, 5.1, 7.3.3, 8 and 9 thereof:

**I. FACTS**

1. Olha KOROBKA (hereinafter the “**Athlete**”), participated in the Games of the XXIX Olympiad in Beijing in 2008 (the “**2008 Olympic Games**”).
2. On 16 August 2008, the Athlete competed in the Women’s +75 kg weightlifting event in which she ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> and for which she was awarded a silver medal.
3. On the same day, the Athlete was requested to provide a urine sample for a doping control. Such sample was identified with the number 1846382.
4. The A-Sample 1846382 was analysed during the 2008 Olympic Games by the WADA-accredited Laboratory in Beijing. Such analysis did not result in an adverse analytical finding at that time.
5. After the conclusion of the 2008 Olympic Games, all the samples collected upon the occasion of the 2008 Olympic Games were transferred to the WADA-accredited “Laboratoire suisse d’analyse du dopage” in Lausanne, Switzerland (“the **Laboratory**”) for long-term storage.
6. The IOC decided to perform further analyses on samples collected during the 2008 Olympic Games. These additional analyses were notably performed with improved analytical methods using more sensitive equipment and/or searching for new metabolites in order to possibly detect Prohibited Substances which were not identified by the analysis performed at the time of the 2008 Olympic Games.
7. In accordance with the provisions of the applicable International Standards for Laboratories (the “**ISL**”), the IOC decided that the reanalysis process would be conducted as follows:
  - An initial analysis was to be conducted on the remains of the A-samples
  - If such initial analysis resulted in the indication of the potential presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers (“Presumptive Adverse Analytical Finding” - PAAF), the full confirmation analysis process (double confirmation) was to be conducted on the B-Sample, which would be split for the occasion into a B1- and a B2 Sample (becoming thus the equivalent of a A- and B-Sample).
8. The decision to proceed based on split B-samples was made in principle for all the re-analysis.

9. This choice was made in view of the fact that during the transfer of the samples from the Beijing laboratory to the Laboratory, the A-Samples were not individually resealed nor transported in sealed containers.
10. At that time, resealing of A-Samples (or transport in sealed containers) was not a requirement pursuant to the then applicable ISL (2008).
11. However, it was felt that the option to rely on the B-Sample constituted an additional precaution securing the strength and reliability of the analytical process.
12. A similar cautious approach was adopted with regard to the implementation of the analytical process and notably of its first phase (opening and splitting of the B-Sample into a B1- and B2-Sample, sealing of the B2-Sample and analysis of the B1-Sample).
13. Pursuant to the ISL, the presence of the Athlete is not a requirement for such first phase of the B-Sample analysis.
14. The IOC nevertheless decided, once again as a matter of principle, that, whenever this was practically possible, the Athlete would be offered the opportunity to attend the above described first phase of the B-sample procedure.
15. The remains of the A-Sample of the Athlete were subject to initial analysis. Such analysis resulted in a Presumptive Adverse Analytical Finding (“**PAAF**”) as it indicated the potential presence of a Prohibited Substance: dehydrochloromethyltestosterone (turinabol).
16. On 11 July 2016, the Athlete through her NOC was informed of the PAAF and of the possibility to attend the opening and splitting of the B-Sample into a B1- and B2-Sample, the sealing of the B2-Sample and the analysis of the B1-Sample. The Athlete was invited to reply by 14 July 2016.
17. On 15 July 2016, the IOC sent a reminder to the Athlete, through her NOC, and granted the Athlete an additional deadline until 18 July 2016 to indicate whether she would attend the opening and splitting of the B-Sample, the sealing of the B2-Sample and the analysis of the B1-Sample scheduled to take place between 19 and 26 July 2016. The Athlete was advised that the process would take place even if no reply was given that reminder.
18. On the same day, the NOC was requested to confirm whether the Athlete had been informed of the correspondence dated 11 July 2016. The IOC reminded the NOC that notice to an athlete could be accomplished by delivery of the notice to the NOC in accordance with Art. 7.3.3 of the Rules.
19. Neither the Athlete, nor the NOC and the IF replied.
20. On 20 July 2016, the IOC sent a reminder to the NOC and requested the NOC to confirm whether the Athlete had received the documentation attached to the correspondence dated 11 July 2016
21. On 21 July 2016, the IOC informed the Athlete, through her NOC, that the opening, splitting of the B-Sample as well as the sealing of the B2-Sample was scheduled to take place on 25 July 2016 at the Laboratory followed by the analysis of the B1-Sample over the following days. The Athlete was advised that she was considered to have been duly notified of the PAAF as per Art. 7.3.3 of the Rules. She was reminded that the process would take place in any event and that the opening, splitting of the B-Sample and sealing of the B2-Sample would be conducted in the presence of an independent witness.

22. On the same day, the IOC reminded the NOC once again that the Athlete would be considered as having been duly notified in accordance with 7.3.3 of the Rules.
23. The opening and splitting of the B-Sample, the sealing of the B2-Sample occurred on 25 July 2016 at the Laboratory.
24. The Athlete did not attend the opening and splitting of the B-Sample and was not represented on this occasion.
25. As provided in the ISL, the opening and splitting was attended by an independent witness.
26. The results of the B1-Sample analysis were reported on 28 July 2016. These results establish the presence of the metabolites of a Prohibited Substance, namely dehydrochloromethyltestosterone (turinabol).
27. Such results constitute an Adverse Analytical Finding. They were reported to the IOC in accordance with article 7.2.1 of the Rules.
28. Further to the verifications set forth in Art. 7.2.2 of the Rules and in application of Art. 7.2.3 of the Rules, the IOC President, Mr Thomas Bach, was informed of the existence of the AAF and the essential details available concerning the case.
29. Pursuant to Art. 7.2.4 of the Rules, the IOC President set up a Disciplinary Commission, consisting in this case of:
  - Mr Denis Oswald (Chairman, Switzerland), who is a member of the IOC Legal Affairs Commission;
  - Mrs Gunilla Lindberg (Sweden)
  - Mr Ugur Erdener (Turkey)
30. On 29 July 2016, the IOC notified the Athlete through her NOC of the above-mentioned AAF and of the institution of disciplinary proceedings to be conducted by the Disciplinary Commission. The IOC also informed the Athlete of her right to request and attend the opening of the B2-Sample and its analysis, either in person and/or through a representative, which was initially scheduled to take place on 8 or 9 August 2016. The Athlete was finally informed of her right to request a copy of the laboratory documentation package.
31. On 8 August 2016, the Athlete through her NOC was granted an additional deadline until 10 August 2016 to indicate whether she accepted the Adverse Analytical Finding, whether she requested the opening and the analysis of the B2-Sample and whether she requested a copy of the laboratory documentation package. She was advised that, in the even no responses was given within the deadline, the IOC might elect not to proceed with the analysis of the B2-Sample and might proceed directly to the procedure in front of the Disciplinary Commission.
32. On the same day, the NOC and the IF were required to assist the IOC in contacting the Athlete.
33. On 10 August 2016, the IOC requested the Athlete, through her National Federation and her NOC, to reply to the correspondence dated 29 July 2016.
34. On 12 August 2016, the Athlete was advised, through her National Federation and her NOC, that the IOC had elected not to proceed with the analysis of the B2-Sample. She was reminded of the content of Art. 7.3.3 of the Rules. The Athlete was also invited to indicate

whether she would attend the hearing of the Disciplinary Commission and/or she would submit a defence in writing.

35. On 15 August 2016, the Athlete sent her Disciplinary Commission Form to the IOC in which she indicated that she would present a defence in writing. She did not indicate whether she would attend the hearing of the Disciplinary Commission, neither personally nor through a representative.
36. On the same day, the Athlete sent the following email to the IOC:  
  
*“I am sorry for not replying on previous letters. As you know I retired from sports a few years ago. Now I’m expecting my first child and all my efforts are for bearing a healthy baby. I try to avoid stresses so I didn’t check my emails.”*
37. On 26 August 2016, the IOC received an email from the Athlete. She repeated that she was pregnant and was trying to avoid stress and negative emotions. She indicated that all her samples provided during and after the Olympic Games 2008 were negative. She asserted that she did not use any prohibited substances.
38. On 31 August 2016, the Athlete was advised that the Disciplinary Commission would issue a decision on the basis of the file.
39. On 27 September 2016, the NOC and the IF were invited to file written observations.
40. Neither the NOC nor the IF filed any written observations.

## **II. APPLICABLE RULES**

41. These proceedings are conducted in application of the Rules.
42. Art. 2.1 of the Rules provides as follows:  
  
*“The presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete’s bodily Specimen.*
  - 2.1.1 *It is each Athlete’s personal duty to ensure that no Prohibited Substance enters his or her body. Athletes are responsible for any Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers found to be present in their bodily Specimens. Accordingly, it is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing Use on the Athlete’s part be demonstrated in order to establish an anti-doping violation under Article 2.1.*
  - 2.1.2 *Excepting those substances for which a quantitative reporting threshold is specifically identified in the Prohibited List, the detected presence of any quantity of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete’s Sample shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation.*
  - 2.1.3 *As an exception to the general rule of Article 2.1, the Prohibited List may establish special criteria for the evaluation of Prohibited Substances that can also be produced endogenously.”*
43. Art. 2.2 of the Rules provides as follows:  
  
*“Use or Attempted Use of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method*

*2.2.1 The success or failure of the Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method is not material. It is sufficient that the Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method was Used or Attempted to be used for an anti-doping rule violation to be committed.”*

44. Art. 5.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

*“The IOC is responsible for Doping Control during the Period of the Olympic Games. The IOC is entitled to delegate all or part of its responsibility for Doping Control to one or several other organisations.*

*The Period of the Olympic Games, or In-Competition Period, is defined as “the period commencing on the date of the opening of the Olympic village for the Olympic Games, namely, 27 July 2008 up until and including the day of the closing ceremony of the Olympic Games, namely, 24 August 2008.*

*All Athletes participating at the Olympic Games shall be subject, during the Period of the Olympic Games, to Doping Control initiated by the IOC at any time or place, with No Advance Notice. Such Doping Control may include Testing for all Prohibited Substances and all Prohibited Methods referred to in the Prohibited List.*

*The IOC shall have the right to conduct or cause to conduct Doping Control during the Period of the Olympic Games, and is responsible for the subsequent handling of such cases.”*

45. Art. 7.2.5 of the Rules provides as follows:

*“The IOC President or a person designated by him shall, in confidence, promptly notify the Athlete or other Person concerned, the Athlete’s or other Person’s chef de mission, the International Federation concerned and a representative of the Independent Observer Program of:*

- a) the adverse analytical finding;*
- b) the Athlete’s right to request the analysis of the B sample or, failing such request, that the B sample analysis may be deemed waived;*
- c) the right of the Athlete and/or the Athlete’s representative to attend the B sample opening and analysis if such analysis is requested;*
- d) the Athlete’s right to request copies of the A and B sample laboratory package, which includes information as required by the International Standard for Laboratories;*
- e) the anti-doping rule violation or of the additional investigation that will be conducted as to whether there is an anti-doping rule violation;*
- f) the composition of the Disciplinary Commission.*

*It shall be the responsibility of the chef de mission to inform, in confidence, the relevant National Anti-Doping Organisation of the Athlete.”*

46. Art. 7.3.3 of the Rules provides as follows:

*“Notice to an Athlete or other Person who has been accredited pursuant to the request of the NOC, may be accomplished by delivery of the notice to the NOC. Notification to the Chef de Mission or the President or the General Secretary of the NOC of the Athlete or other Person shall be deemed to be a delivery of notice to the NOC.”*

47. Art. 8.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

*“A violation of these Rules in connection with Doping Control automatically leads to Disqualification of the Athlete with all other consequences, including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes.”*

48. Art. 9.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

*“An Anti-Doping Rule violation occurring during or in connection with the Olympic Games may lead to Disqualification of all of the Athlete’s results obtained in the Olympic Games with all consequences, including forfeiture of all medals, points and prizes, except as provided in Article 9.1.1.”*

49. Art. 9.1.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

*“If the Athlete establishes that he or she bears No Fault or Negligence for the violation, the Athlete’s results in the other Competition shall not be Disqualified unless the Athlete’s results in Competitions other than the Competition in which the anti-doping rule violation occurred were likely to have been affected by the Athlete’s anti-doping rule violation”.*

50. Art. 9.3 of the Rules provides as follows:

*“The management of anti-doping rule violations and the conduct of additional hearings as a consequence of hearings and decisions of the IOC, including with regard to the imposition of sanctions over and above those relating to the Olympic Games, shall be managed by the relevant International Federation”.*

### **III. DISCUSSION**

51. The presence of metabolites of a Prohibited Substance, i.e. dehydrochloromethyltestosterone (turinabol), has been established in 2016 in the sample 1846382 that the Athlete provided on 16 August 2008, upon the occasion of the 2008 Olympic Games.
52. The substance detected in the Athlete’s sample is an anabolic steroid. It is listed in the WADA 2008 Prohibited List and in all subsequent lists.
53. The Disciplinary Commission is satisfied that the sample which has been re-analysed by the Laboratory is unequivocally linked to the Athlete and that no relevant departure from the WADA International Standards occurred.
54. The Athlete does not challenge the validity of the analytical results. In her written observations, the Athlete simply denies having used performance-enhancing substances and offers no substantial explanation.
55. Based on the analytical results establishing the presence of a Prohibited Substance in the Athlete’s sample, the Disciplinary Commission finds that the Athlete has in any event committed an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to Art. 2.1 of the Rules.
56. In addition, the Disciplinary Commission finds that an anti-doping rule violation is also established if the circumstances are considered in the perspective of art. 2.2 of the Rules.
57. The Disciplinary Commission observes that the nature of the substance which was found in the Athlete’s sample is consistent with intentional use of Prohibited Substances specifically ingested to deliberately improve performance. The fact that the metabolite of a doping substance, which is a “classical” doping substance was found, supports this consideration.

58. In conclusion, the Disciplinary Commission finds that an anti-doping violation is thus established pursuant to both Art. 2.1 and Art. 2.2 of the Rules.
59. The consequences of an anti-doping rule violation under the Rules are limited to consequences in connection with the 2008 Olympic Games. They are set forth in Art. 8 and 9 of the Rules and are the following.
60. In application of Art. 8.1 and/or Art. 9 of the Rules, the results achieved by the Athlete at the Women's +75 kg weightlifting event in which she ranked 2nd during the 2008 Olympic Games, shall be annulled, with all resulting consequences (notably withdrawal of medal, diploma, pin etc.).
61. In application of Art. 9.3 of the Rules, the further management of the consequences of the anti-doping rule violations and in particular the imposition of sanctions over and above those related to the Olympic Games 2008 shall be conducted by the International Weightlifting Federation ("**IWF**").

\* \* \* \* \*

CONSIDERING the above, pursuant to the Olympic Charter and, in particular, Rule 59.2.1 thereof, and pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXIX Olympiad in Beijing in 2008 and, in particular, 2, 5.1, 7.3.3, 8 and 9 thereof.

THE DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE  
DECIDES

- I. The Athlete, Olha KOROBKA:
  - (i) is found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXIX Olympiad in Beijing in 2008 (presence and/or use, of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an athlete's bodily specimen),
  - (ii) is disqualified from the Women's +75 kg weightlifting event in which she participated upon the occasion of the Olympic Games Beijing 2008,
  - (iii) has the medal, the medallist pin and the diploma obtained in the Women's 75 kg weightlifting event withdrawn and is ordered to return the same.
- II. The IWF is requested to modify the results of the above-mentioned event accordingly and to consider any further action within its own competence.
- III. The National Olympic Committee of Ukraine shall ensure full implementation of this decision.
- IV. The National Olympic Committee of Ukraine shall notably secure the return to the IOC, as soon as possible, of the medal, the medallist pin and the diploma awarded in connection with the Women's +75 kg weightlifting event.
- V. This decision enters into force immediately.

Lausanne, 19 October 2016

In the name of the IOC Disciplinary Commission



Denis Oswald, Chairman



Gunilla Lindberg



Ugur Erdener