
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Mr Thantsha Reghen Magwai

Introduction

1. World Athletics has established the Athletics Integrity Unit ("**AIU**") whose role is to protect the integrity of the sport of Athletics, including fulfilling World Athletics' obligations as a Signatory to the World Anti-Doping Code ("the "**Code**"). World Athletics has delegated implementation of the World Athletics Anti-Doping Rules ("**ADR**") to the AIU, including but not limited to the following activities in relation to International-Level Athletes: Testing, Investigations, Results Management, Hearings, Sanctions and Appeals.
2. Mr Thantsha Reghen Magwai ("the **Athlete**") is a 34-year-old Athlete from South Africa that specialises in the marathon¹.
3. This decision is issued by the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR, which provides as follows:

"8.5.6 In the event that the Athlete or other Person either (i) admits the violation and accepts the proposed Consequences or (ii) is deemed to have admitted the violation and accepted the Consequences as per Rule 8.5.2(f), the Integrity Unit will promptly:

- (a) issue a decision confirming the commission of the violation(s) and the imposition of the specified Consequences (including, if applicable, a justification for why the maximum potential sanction was not imposed);*
- (b) Publicly Report that decision in accordance with Rule 14;*
- (c) send a copy of the decision to the Athlete or other Person and to any other party that has a right, further to Rule 13, to appeal the decision (and any such party may, within 15 days of receipt, request a copy of the full case file pertaining to the decision)."*

The Athlete's Commission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations

4. Rule 2 ADR sets out that the following shall constitute an Anti-Doping Rule Violation:

¹ <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/south-africa/regan-magwai-14694168>

“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”

5. On 3 May 2026, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition at the Durban International Marathon in Durban, South Africa, which was given code 8434180 (the **“Sample”**).
6. Analysis of the Sample by the World Anti-Doping Agency (**“WADA”**)-accredited laboratory in Doha, Qatar revealed the presence of Morphine at a concentration above the applicable Decision Limit specified in WADA Technical Document TD2022DL (the **“Adverse Analytical Finding”**).
7. Morphine is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2026 Prohibited List under the category S7. Narcotics. It is a Specified Substance prohibited In-Competition only.
8. The AIU reviewed the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5 of the International Standard for Results Management (**“ISRM”**) and determined that:
 - 8.1.1. The Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption (**“TUE”**) that had been granted for the morphine found in the Sample; and
 - 8.1.2. there was no apparent departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations (**“ISTI”**) or from the International Standard for Laboratories (**“ISL”**) that could reasonably have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding.
9. Therefore, in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 ISRM, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations on 14 August 2026, which, inter alia, informed him of his rights to request the laboratory documentation supporting the Adverse Analytical Finding, the B Sample analysis and the associated laboratory documentation at his own cost. The Athlete was also invited to provide his detailed written explanation for the presence of morphine in the Sample and was informed that he could admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accept the Consequences specified by the AIU.
10. On 15 August 2026, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete.

Consequences

11. This is the Athlete’s first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
12. Rule 10.2 ADR specifies that the period of Ineligibility for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.1 ADR or Rule 2.2 ADR shall be as follows:

“10.2.1 Save where Rule 10.2.4 applies, the period of Ineligibility will be four years where:

- (a) The anti-doping rule violation does not involve a Specified Substance or a Specified Method, unless the Athlete or other Person can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was not intentional.*
- (b) The anti-doping rule violation involves a Specified Substance or a Specified Method and the Integrity Unit can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was intentional.*

10.2.2 If Rule 10.2.1 does not apply, then (subject to Rule 10.2.4(a)) the period of Ineligibility will be two years.”

13. Morphine is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2026 Prohibited List under the category S7. Narcotics. It is a Specified Substance prohibited In-Competition only.
14. The period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore a period of two (2) years, unless the AIU demonstrates that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were intentional.
15. The AIU has no evidence that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were intentional and the mandatory period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore a period of two (2) years.
16. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR, and accepted the period of Ineligibility of two (2) years, the AIU confirms by this decision the following consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:
 - 16.1. a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years commencing on 14 August 2026 and expiring on 13 August 2028; and
 - 16.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results at the 2026 Durban International Marathon² and from 3 May 2026 until the date of this Decision³, with all resulting consequences including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points and prize and appearance money.
17. The Athlete has accepted the above Consequences for his Anti-Doping Rule Violations and has expressly waived his right to have those Consequences determined at a hearing.

Publication

18. In accordance with Rule 8.5.6(b) ADR, the AIU shall publicly report this decision on the AIU's website.

² In accordance with Rule 9 ADR.

³ In accordance with Rule 10.10 ADR.

Rights of Appeal

19. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
20. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, WADA and the South African Institute for Drug-free Sport ("**SAIDS**") have a right of appeal against this decision to the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne, Switzerland, in accordance with the procedure set out at Rule 13.6.1 ADR.
21. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or SAIDS, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise his right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 18 August 2026