BETWEEN SPORT INTEGRITY COMMISSION

Applicant

AND SHANNON DRAKE

Respondent

AND BOXING NEW ZEALAND

Interested party

DECISION 29 OCTOBER 2025

Hearing Decision on the papers – agreement on sanction

Parties Wendy Pickering & Hayden Tapper, Sport Integrity Commission

David Bullock, Adam McDonald & Ben Forbes counsel for Applicant

Shannon Drake, Respondent Ian Hunt, counsel for Respondent

Trish Hudson, Boxing NZ (Interested Party)

Hearing Panel Andrea Twaddle (Acting Chair)

Registrar Luke Macris

Jurisdiction

 Shannon Drake is a New Zealand boxer and athlete player who is registered with Boxing NZ. Boxing NZ has adopted the 2025 Sports Anti-Doping Rules (SADR) promulgated by the Sport Integrity Commission (the Commission) as its anti-doping policy.

Procedural Background & Anti-Doping Rule Violations (ADRVs)

- A sample was collected from Mr Drake at the South Island Golden Gloves event held in Blenheim on 1 June 2025. The sample collected was urine and occurred incompetition.
- 3. Analysis by a WADA-accredited laboratory (the Australian Sports Drug Testing Laboratory) of Mr Drake's A sample returned an Adverse Analytical Finding (AAF) for the presence of Cannabinoids/Carboxy-Tetrahydrocannabinol (Cannabis), which is a specified substance prohibited in-competition under class S8 of the 2025 WADA Prohibited List. It is classed as a Substance of Abuse in the 2025 WADA Prohibited List.
- 4. Mr Drake was notified of his AAF on 25 July 2025.
- 5. On 30 July 2025, Mr Hunt (counsel for Mr Drake) confirmed that Mr Drake voluntarily accepted provisional suspension, and the Tribunal made an order accordingly.
- 6. On 31 July 2025, Mr Drake confirmed to the Commission via his counsel that he did not wish to have his B sample analysed.
- 7. On 13 August 2025, the Commission filed and served its Form 1 and evidence in support. The Commission alleged that Mr Drake breached:
 - (a) SADR r. 2.1 (Presence of a Prohibited Substance of its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample); and
 - (b) SADR r. 2.2 (Use or Attempted Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method).
- 8. On 13 August 2025, Mr Drake filed and served his Form 2 and supporting evidence. Mr Drake admitted the violations but sought to be heard as to sanction. Mr Drake's evidence is that he used cannabis Out-of-Competition and that his use was unrelated to sports performance.

9. On 13 October 2025, the parties filed a joint memorandum of counsel – a copy of which

is annexed. The Commission accepted the evidence submitted by Mr Drake and the

parties submitted that the appropriate sanction was to impose a three-month period of

ineligibility on Mr Drake pursuant to SADR r. 10.2.4.1.

Sanction

10. The Tribunal, having considered all the available material, is satisfied that it is

appropriate to impose a period of ineligibility of three (3) months pursuant to SADR r.

10.2.4.1, backdated to the date of the provisional suspension order.

11. There is no basis on which to reduce the sanction further under SADR r. 10.2.4.1 as

Mr Drake has not completed a substance of abuse programme.

Orders

12. The Tribunal **orders** as follows:

> (i) A period of ineligibility from participation in any capacity in a competition

or activity organised, sanctioned, or authorised by any sporting

organisation that is a signatory to the SADR, of three (3) months is

imposed on Mr Drake under SADR r. 10.2.4.1, backdated to commence

on 30 July 2025 (being the date of the provisional suspension order).

(ii) This means Mr Drake is ineligible to participate in competitive sports until

30 October 2025.

(iii) This determination should be the final determination by the Tribunal in

this matter, and it may be published in the usual way.

Appeal routes & deadlines

13. Appeal routes are set out at SADR 13.2 and, in accordance with SADR 13.2.3.5, the

time to file an appeal to Court of Arbitration of Sport (CAS) is twenty-one (21) days

from the date of receipt of the decision by the appealing party.

14. The address to which any appeal should be sent to is:

Anti-Doping Division:

Dated: 29 October 2025

Andrea Twaddle

Acting Chair

Sports Tribunal of New Zealand

ST 06/25

between

SPORT INTEGRITY COMMISSION

Applicant

and

SHANNON DRAKE

Respondent

JOINT MEMORANDUM OF COUNSEL

13 October 2025

LeeSalmonLong

Barristers and Solicitors LEVEL 34 VERO CENTRE 48 SHORTLAND STREET PO BOX 2026 SHORTLAND STREET AUCKLAND NEW ZEALAND TELEPHONE 64 9 912 7100

EMAIL: david.bullock@lsl.co.nz SOLICITOR ON RECORD: DAVID BULLOCK EMAIL: adam.mcdonald@isl.co.nz SOLICITOR ACTING: ADAM MCDONALD

MAY IT PLEASE THE TRIBUNAL

- 1. This memorandum is filed jointly for the Sport Integrity Commission (Commission) and Mr Drake regarding alleged breaches of the Sports Anti-Doping Rules 2025 (SADR).
- Mr Drake has admitted the anti-doping rule violations.
- 3. The parties have considered all of the material filed in this matter and jointly submit that the appropriate sanction to be imposed for the Anti-Doping Rule Violation (ADRV) is a period of three months, with credit for the time served under the provisional suspension.

ADRVs alleged by the Commission

- 4. Mr Drake was tested In-Competition at the South Island Golden Gloves Boxing event in Blenheim on 1 June 2025.
- 5. The analysis of Mr Drake's A Sample returned an Adverse Analytical Finding (**AAF**) for the presence of Cannabinoids/Carboxy-Tetrahydrocannabinol.
- 6. The Commission alleges that Mr Drake breached:
 - (a) r 2.1 (Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample); and
 - (b) r 2.2 (Use or Attempted Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method).
- Carboxy-Tetrahydrocannabinol is a Specified Substance prohibited In-Competition under section 8 Cannabinoids in the 2025 WADA Prohibited List. It is classed as a Substance of Abuse in the 2025 WADA Prohibited List.

Procedural Background

- 8. Mr Drake was notified of his AAF on 25 July 2025.
- On 30 July 2025, Mr Drake voluntarily accepted provisional suspension, and the Tribunal made an order accordingly.
- 10. On 31 July 2025, Mr Drake confirmed he did not wish to have his B Sample tested.
- On 13 August 2025, the Commission filed and served its Form 1 and evidence in support.
- 12. On 29 August 2025, Mr Drake filed and served his Form 2 and supporting evidence. Mr Drake admitted the violations but sought to be heard as to sanction.

Sanction

13. SADR r 10.2.1.2 provides that for a violation of rr 2.1 or 2.2;

The period of *Ineligibility*, subject to Rule 10.2.4 shall be four years where: ...

The anti-doping rule violation involves a *Specified Substance* or a *Specified Method* and the *Commission* can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was intentional.

14. SADR r 10.2.4.1 provides that, where an ADRV involves a Substance of Abuse:

If the *Athlete* can establish that any ingestion or *Use* occurred *Out-of-Competition* and was unrelated to sport performance, then the period of *Ineligibility* shall be three months *Ineligibility*.

- 15. Mr Drake's evidence is that he used cannabis Out-of-Competition and that his use was unrelated to sports performance. Having considered Mr Drake's evidence, the Commission accepts Mr Drake's position.
- The parties agree that if Mr Drake's use and possession is found by the Tribunal to have occurred Out-of-Competition and be unrelated to sports performance, then the starting point for the applicable period of ineligibility will be three months from the date of his provisional suspension. In this case there is no basis for further reduction. Mr Drake's position is that notwithstanding his efforts he has not been able to locate and complete a substance of abuse programme.

Applicable sanction

- 17. The parties submit that it is open to and appropriate for the Tribunal to impose a three-month period of ineligibility on Mr Drake.
- 18. Mr Drake is entitled, pursuant to r 10.13.2.1, to credit for the period of provisional suspension since 30 July 2025.
- 19. On this basis, Mr Drake's period of ineligibility will run to 30 October 2025.

Dated 13 October 2025

Adam McDonald / Ben Forbes Counsel for the applicant

Ian Hunt
Counsel for the respondent