
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Mr Lawrence Cheronno

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 Lawrence Cheronno ("the **Athlete**") is a 35-year-old road runner from Kenya.¹
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:

"2.1 Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample

[...]

¹ <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/kenya/lawrence-cherono-14687675>

2.2 *Use or Attempted Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method*

[...]

2.5 *Tampering or Attempted Tampering with any part of Doping Control by an Athlete or other Person*

5. On 23 May 2022, the Athlete provided a urine Sample Out-of-Competition in Kaptagat, Kenya, which was given code 1032656 (the "**Sample**").
6. On 13 July 2022, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited Laboratory in Lausanne, Switzerland, reported that analysis of the Sample had revealed the presence of Trimetazidine (the "**Adverse Analytical Finding**").
7. Trimetazidine is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2022 Prohibited List under the category S4 Hormone and Metabolic Modulators. It is a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times.
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. the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption ("**TUE**") that had been granted (or that would be granted) for the Trimetazidine found in the Sample; and
 - 8.2. 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. On 14 July 2022, the AIU issued a Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations to the Athlete, in-person in Eugene, Oregon, USA ("the **Notice of Allegation**"). The Notice of Allegation informed the Athlete that a Provisional Suspension may be imposed in his case and invited him to provide an immediate (in-person) explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding followed by a full and detailed written explanation by no later than 22 July 2022.
10. The Athlete was also informed of his rights, *inter alia*, to request the B Sample analysis, to request copies of the laboratory documentation supporting the Adverse Analytical Finding and to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR.
11. During the in-person notification, the Athlete explained to an AIU representative that he had been experiencing stomach problems around the time that the Sample was collected from him, and, after speaking with a friend, ██████████², he had been advised to visit a

² In February 2022, the AIU imposed a period of Ineligibility of ██████████ on ██████████ from ██████████ ██████████ for the presence of ██████████ in a Sample collected from him on ██████████.

doctor called “*Joshua*” in Eldoret. The Athlete confirmed that this doctor, Joshua, had given him erythromycin and injected him with an unknown substance.

12. On 16 July 2022, the Athlete sent an e-mail to the AIU stating that the Adverse Analytical Finding was a shock to him and that he suspected the involvement of his training colleagues in some way because they were jealous of his success. The Athlete noted that he did not intend to cheat but accepted the outcome.
13. The AIU rejected the Athlete’s explanations, and a Provisional Suspension was imposed upon him on 16 July 2022.
14. Following the Athlete’s request for an extension, on 11 August 2022, the Athlete submitted his detailed written explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding to the AIU. The written explanation was materially different to the explanation that the Athlete had given to the AIU representative in-person and to the e-mail that he submitted in July 2022.
15. In summary, the Athlete’s written explanation set out that his wife attended the Wayside Medical Centre (“the **Clinic**”) on 18 May 2022 and was prescribed medication including Carvidon tablets (trimetazidine).³ The Athlete explained that, following his return from a training session on 22 May 2022, he had pain in his muscles and asked his wife for a painkiller which he took immediately. The Athlete suspected that his wife had (inadvertently) given him a Carvidon tablet instead of the painkiller that he had asked for on 22 May 2022.
16. In support of this explanation, the Athlete submitted a Laboratory Request from the Clinic, which included hand-written details of medications prescribed to his wife including Carvidon tablets (“the **Laboratory Request**”), and a photograph of the underside of tablets enclosed in their blister packaging.
17. On 16 August 2022, the AIU asked the Anti-Doping Agency of Kenya (“**ADAK**”) to assist with an investigation into the Athlete’s explanation and the authenticity of the Laboratory Request.
18. ADAK representatives visited the Clinic and requested information to verify the Athlete’s explanation. On their return to the Clinic the following day, ADAK representatives collected a letter in the name of Joshua Migiro Atina (“the **Clinic Director**”) dated 25 August 2022 (the “**First Clinic Response**”) which attested to the veracity of the Athlete’s wife’s symptoms, the medicines prescribed to her and the authenticity of the Laboratory Request, and enclosed a copy of the Clinic’s Outpatient Register for 18 May 2022 (“the **Register**”).
19. On 9 September 2022, the Athlete attended an interview with AIU representatives and provided further details in relation to his explanations.
20. On 15 September 2022, the Athlete submitted additional medical documents to the AIU (stamped by the Clinic) concerning further treatment given to his wife on 13 September 2022

³ Carvidon is an anti-anginal medication used to treat heart-related chest pain (angina) and contains trimetazidine hydrochloride (see https://www.1mg.com/drugs/carvidon-mr-tablet-203793?wpsrc=Google+Organic+Search_)

to treat symptoms like those that she had allegedly experienced on 18 May 2022 (the “**Additional Documents**”).

21. By reply on the same date, the AIU asked the Athlete to provide several documents that the AIU requested during the interview on 9 September 2022, including his wife’s signed consent to sharing/disclosure of medical records related to her treatment at the Clinic.
22. On 17 September 2022, the Athlete submitted an “OFFICIAL RECEIPT” dated 18 May 2022 (the “**Receipt**”) and a handwritten “*medical report*” from the Clinic dated 18 May 2022 (stamped 17 September 2022), which gave details of the symptoms experienced by, and treatment given to, the Athlete’s wife on 18 May 2022 (“the **Medical Report**”). The Athlete also submitted his wife’s signed consent to sharing of her medical records.
23. Upon review of the information submitted, the AIU noted that the Laboratory Request, the Receipt and the Medical Report had identical signatures to that on the First Clinic Response. The AIU therefore concluded that the Athlete’s documents had not been independently verified.
24. Furthermore, the AIU identified several inconsistencies in and between the documents relating to the Athlete’s wife’s alleged medical treatment, including:
 - 24.1. the Register specifies that the Outpatient Number for the Athlete’s wife (“**OP No.**”) is 886. However, the Laboratory Request states that the OP/IP No for the Athlete’s wife is a different number, 2713/22;
 - 24.2. the Laboratory Request contains no details of any blood test results and has the line “Investigations” scored through (i.e., indicating that no tests or investigations were conducted). However, the First Clinic Response and the Medical Report both refer to blood work/analysis and results;
 - 24.3. the medications listed on the Laboratory Request are different to those on the Medical Report; the Laboratory Request contains no reference to any medication containing trimetazidine⁴; and
 - 24.4. the Register includes several amendments to the OP Nos. for patients seen on 18 May 2022. The first entry has been corrected from OP No. 884 to be a repeat visit and all subsequent OP Nos. have been amended, except for the entry for the Athlete’s wife. The AIU therefore considered that the details of the Athlete’s wife’s visit on 18 May 2022 may have been added later.
25. Pursuant to the foregoing, the AIU requested ADAK’s further assistance in independently verifying the documents that the Athlete had submitted to explain the Adverse Analytical Finding.

⁴ The Laboratory Request lists Carvidon tablets (which contain trimetazidine) whereas the Medical Report lists no Carvidon and only indicates intravenous administration of (1) Ceftriaxone (2) Hydrocortisone and (3) Tramadol as having been prescribed.

26. On 21 November 2022, ADAK therefore wrote to the Clinic requesting additional information.
27. On 1 December 2022, the Clinic Director responded to ADAK's request stating that the Laboratory Request, the First Clinic Response, the Receipt, the Medical Report and the Additional Documents were not genuine/official documents from the Clinic and that the information they contained was not true and accurate ("the **Second Clinic Response**").
28. At the AIU's request, on 8 December 2022, ADAK wrote to the Clinic requesting an explanation for the statement that the documents were not genuine/authentic documents and that they contained inaccurate information. ADAK also requested disclosure of the Athlete's wife's medical records in accordance with the consent to disclosure that the Athlete's wife had provided on 17 September 2022.
29. From this point in the chronology of events, the AIU investigation into the Athlete's explanation and the documents submitted (as set out above) was materially obstructed and substantially undermined. The AIU made repeated requests to obtain copies of medical records held by the Clinic to corroborate the Athlete's wife's alleged medical treatment (including via ADAK through the Kenyan courts) which have been unsuccessful. Ultimately, the Clinic confirmed that no records are available in relation to the Athlete's wife's alleged medical treatment on 18 May 2022.
30. In a letter dated 14 November 2022 [sic] (stamped 14 December 2022) the Clinic Director, responded to ADAK's letter of 8 December 2022 stating that the Clinic was unable to provide information unless ADAK demonstrated a relationship between the treatment and doping and that it could not act on a consent "*whose source and authenticity are unverified*".
31. Therefore, on 10 January 2023, the AIU wrote to the Athlete noting that it had sought information from the Clinic in accordance with his wife's signed consent for disclosure of medical records that she provided in September 2022, and that the Clinic had indicated that it could only act on a consent executed (by the patient) in the Clinic.
32. The AIU therefore asked the Athlete to attend the Clinic with his wife the following day (11 January 2023) to confirm her consent to sharing/disclosure of her medical records with the AIU and for an ADAK representative to immediately receive those records on behalf of the AIU.
33. It was ultimately agreed that the Athlete would attend the Clinic at 14:00 on 12 January 2023 (together with an ADAK representative) to confirm his wife's consent and for her records to be handed to ADAK on behalf of the AIU.
34. During the visit to the Clinic on 12 January 2023, the Clinic Director insisted on seeking legal advice before disclosing the Athlete's wife's medical records and informed the ADAK representative that the First Clinic Response and the Register (on 25 August 2022) had been produced without his knowledge (despite being signed in his name).
35. No medical records for the Athlete's wife were made available to the ADAK representative on 12 January 2023.

36. From 17 January 2023, the AIU made further arrangements for an AIU representative to attend the Clinic together with the Athlete and his wife to obtain her medical records.
37. On 18 January 2023, an investigator working on behalf of the AIU contacted the Athlete who agreed to be present at the Clinic with his wife at 12:00 noon the next day, 19 January 2023. During this conversation, the Athlete indicated that he was having difficulties obtaining his wife's cooperation and with obtaining her records from the Clinic.
38. On 19 January 2023, the Athlete attended the Clinic with his wife accompanied by the investigator. According to the investigator's report, the Athlete's wife claimed that she had been forced to give her consent and that she did not want her records disclosed to the AIU (being a "*foreign company*"). The Clinic Director also claimed that he was unable to provide the records to the AIU because the Athlete's wife is not an athlete.
39. Again, no medical records for the Athlete's wife were provided on 19 January 2023.
40. On 9 February 2023, ADAK therefore wrote to the Clinic compelling the Clinic to produce copies of the Athlete's wife's medical records in accordance with powers under s.30(2)(b) of the Kenya Anti-Doping Act⁵ ("the **First Summons**"). The Clinic failed to respond.
41. On 25 April 2023, the Athlete attended a further interview with AIU representatives and discussed the provision of his wife's medical records. Contrary to the position taken by his wife on 19 January 2023, the Athlete stated that his wife had provided her consent to disclose her medical records and confirmed that his wife had not withdrawn her consent for disclosure to the AIU, but that the Clinic was refusing to provide the records.
42. Therefore, to facilitate the disclosure of his wife's medical records, on 10 May 2023, the AIU wrote to the Athlete, setting out that, in circumstances where he had confirmed that his wife's consent had not been withdrawn, and remained valid, the AIU saw no reason why those records could not be obtained and provided to the Athlete to corroborate his explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding.
43. The AIU made it clear that it considered the Athlete to be under an obligation to cooperate fully with the AIU investigation, including procuring, to the best of his ability, the provision by his wife of her medical records of the treatment that she received on 18 May 2022, and providing those records to the AIU by no later than Friday 12 May 2023.

⁵ Section 30(2)(b) of the Kenya Anti-Doping Act provides as follows:

"30. Power of search, entry and interrogation

[...]

(2) If the anti-doping compliance officer suspects that any person found at the premises vessel or vehicle may provide useful information, he or she may –

[...]

(b) demand from that person any book, document, article, object or substance which may assist in identifying any prohibited substance or person dealing in prohibited substances"

44. The AIU asked the Athlete to confirm a specific date and time before the end of the day on Friday 12 May 2023 that he would attend the Clinic with his wife to obtain her medical records and provide them to the AIU.
45. Following the above request, the AIU arranged for surveillance of the Clinic to be conducted from the morning of 11 May 2023.
46. According to the Surveillance Report, on 11 May 2023, the Athlete arrived at the Clinic alone at 15:50 local time and was observed inside the Clinic in discussions with Clinic staff, including a junior doctor and the Clinic Director. The Athlete was then observed leaving the Clinic at 16:50 with nothing in his possession.
47. By e-mail sent at 19:32 CEST (20:32 EAT) on 11 May 2023, the Athlete provided the AIU with copies of handwritten correspondence dated 11 May 2023 (i) from the Athlete to his wife requesting disclosure of her "*medical report dated 18/05/2022 at Wayside clinic*" and (ii) the Athlete's wife to the Athlete stating that she would "*commit myself tomorrow to go and request for my medical report at Wayside clinic*" and hand these to the Athlete. The Athlete's cover e-mail confirmed that he and his wife would attend the Clinic the following day at 13:00 EAT.
48. On 12 May 2023, the Athlete wrote to the AIU stating that his wife had not been provided with her medical records because the Clinic claimed that "*it was against their code of ethics concerning the report ADAK representatives took before issuing her consent to the hospital*".
49. On 28 June 2023, the Athlete attended a further interview with AIU representatives in relation to his visits to the Clinic in May 2023. Initially, the Athlete confirmed that he had called an individual called Josephat who worked at the Clinic in the evening on 11 May 2023, and was told to visit the Clinic the following day. The Athlete confirmed that he went about his usual daily work on 11 May 2023, aside from visiting town at around 16:00 to meet a friend. The Athlete also confirmed that he then visited the Clinic with his wife on 12 May 2023, but that the Clinic had refused to provide copies of his wife's medical records.
50. AIU representatives confronted the Athlete with the information that, contrary to his account, the AIU had evidence that he had visited the Clinic alone at 15:50 on 11 May 2023 for around an hour and that he had met with Josephat Mokoya and the Clinic Director. The Athlete was asked to explain what had happened during this time and he stated that he had visited the Clinic on 11 May 2023 to discuss the documents that he was required to provide to the AIU by 12 May 2023.
51. When asked to explain why the Clinic had refused to provide his wife with her medical records, the Athlete stated that the Clinic was concerned about being sued by other patients whose medical records had allegedly been photographed by ADAK.
52. Following discussions between the AIU and ADAK (and following advice taken by ADAK from the Kenya Department of Public Prosecutions with respect to potential criminal action against the Clinic), on 26 October 2023, ADAK served the Clinic with a further written notice compelling the Clinic to produce copies of the Athlete's wife's medical records in accordance with its powers under s.30(2)(b) of the Kenya Anti-Doping Act ("the **Second Summons**").

53. On 27 October 2023, the Clinic replied to the Second Summons through its appointed attorneys stating that patient records are confidential and privileged and that there was no basis to release medical records for the Athlete's wife in investigations "*unrelated to her*".
54. On 10 November 2023, ADAK wrote to the Clinic's appointed attorneys rejecting the arguments that the Clinic was not required to comply with the Second Summons and confirmed that a full response to the Second Summons was required in no more than 7 days.
55. The Clinic failed to respond to the Second Summons.
56. On 11 March 2024, ADAK therefore made an ex-parte application in the Chief Magistrates Court in Eldoret, Kenya for an order compelling the production of documents by the Clinic. The order was granted ("the **Court Order**").
57. On 5 April 2024, ADAK representatives served the Clinic with the Court Order.
58. On 12 April 2024, the Clinic responded to the Court Order stating that there were no records available (for any treatment given to the Athlete's wife since 1 May 2022, including on 18 May 2022 and 13 September 2022).
59. The Clinic also confirmed that the First Clinic Response had been signed by an assistant administrator (i.e., not by the Clinic Director) and that the Laboratory Request, the Register the Medical Report and the First Clinic Response, were not genuine because they were written by unauthorised persons.
60. Following a review of the above, on 12 June 2024, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Charge in accordance with Rule 8.5.1 ADR and Article 7.1 ISRM confirming that he was being charged with Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR (Presence), Rule 2.2 ADR (Use) and Rule 2.5 ADR (Tampering or Attempted Tampering)⁶ ("the **Charge**") and that those Anti-Doping Rule Violations warranted a total period of Ineligibility of eight (8) years pursuant to Rules 10.2.1(a) ADR and Rule 10.9.3(c) ADR (i.e., four (4) years for the presence of a Non-Specified Substance and four (4) years for Tampering or Attempted Tampering with any part of Doping Control to be served consecutively).
61. On 26 June 2024, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete.

⁶ In addition to the Presence and Use violations, the AIU was also satisfied that the Athlete had committed a violation of Rule 2.5 ADR for Tampering or Attempted Tampering with any part of Doping Control by submitting misleading, forged/falsified information to the AIU, based on (without limitation) the inconsistencies identified in and between the documents that the Athlete submitted (as set out in paragraph 24, above), the confirmation from the Clinic that the Laboratory Request, the Receipt, the Medical Report and the Additional Documents are not genuine/official documents from the Clinic and that the information they contain is untrue and inaccurate and the confirmation from the Clinic that there were no available records which corroborated the Athlete's claims as to his wife's medical treatment on 18 May 2022. In addition, the AIU was also satisfied that the Athlete had obstructed and/or delayed the AIU investigation, which is sufficient for proceedings to be brought for a violation of Rule 2.5 ADR in accordance with Rule 5.7.10 ADR.

Consequences

62. Collectively, the Anti-Doping Rule Violations pursuant to Rule 2.1 ADR, Rule 2.2 ADR and Rule 2.5 ADR constitute the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation in accordance with Rule 10.9.3(c) ADR.

63. Rule 10.2 ADR specifies that the period of Ineligibility for Anti-Doping Rule Violations 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. intentional."

64. Trimetazidine is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2022 Prohibited List under the category S4 Hormone and Metabolic Modulators. It is a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times.

65. The period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years, unless the Athlete demonstrates that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional.

66. The Athlete has not demonstrated that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional. Therefore, the mandatory period of Ineligibility is a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years.

67. In addition, Rule 10.3.1 ADR specifies the period of Ineligibility to be imposed for a breach of Rule 2.5 ADR (Tampering or Attempted Tampering) as follows:

"10.3.1 For violations of Rule 2.3 or Rule 2.5, the period of Ineligibility will be four (4) years except: (i) in the case of failing to submit to Sample collection, if the Athlete can establish that the commission of the anti-doping rule violation was not intentional, the period of Ineligibility will be two (2) years; (ii) in all other cases, if the Athlete or other Person can establish exceptional circumstances that justify a reduction of the period of Ineligibility, the period of Ineligibility will be in a range from two (2) years to four (4) years depending on the Athlete's or other Person's degree of Fault; or (iii) in a case involving a Protected Person or Recreational Athlete, the period of Ineligibility will be in a range between a maximum of two (2) years and, at a minimum, a reprimand and no period of Ineligibility, depending on the Protected Person or Recreational Athlete's degree of Fault."

68. The Athlete has not established any exceptional circumstances that exist to justify any reduction in the period of Ineligibility of four (4) years to be imposed for the Anti-Doping Rule Violation committed pursuant to Rule 2.5 ADR.

69. Rule 10.9.3(c)ADR also states as follows:

“10.9.3 Additional rules for certain potential multiple violations

[...]

(c) If the Integrity Unit establishes that an Athlete or other Person committed a violation of Rule 2.5 in connection with the Doping Control process for an underlying asserted anti-doping rule violation, the violation of Rule 2.5 will be treated as a stand-alone first violation and the period of Ineligibility for such violation must be served consecutively (rather than concurrently) with the period of Ineligibility, if any, imposed for the underlying anti-doping rule violation. Where this Rule 10.9.3(c) is applied, the violations taken together will constitute a single violation for purposes of Rule 10.9.1.”

70. The Athlete committed the violation of Rule 2.5 ADR in connection with the Doping Control Process for an underlying asserted Anti-Doping Rule Violation (specifically during Results Management of the Adverse Analytical Finding following his receipt of the Notice of Allegation on 14 July 2022) and therefore falls squarely within this provision.

71. The violation of Rule 2.5 ADR shall therefore be treated as a standalone first violation and the four (4)-year period of Ineligibility must be served consecutively to the four (4)-year period of Ineligibility to be imposed for the violations of Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR (i.e., a total period of Ineligibility of eight (8) years).

72. However, Rule 10.8.1 ADR provides that an athlete potentially subject to an asserted period of Ineligibility of four (4) years or more may benefit from a one (1)-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility based on an early admission and acceptance of sanction:

“10.8.1 One year reduction for certain anti-doping rule violations based on early admission and acceptance of sanction.

Where the Integrity Unit notifies an Athlete or other Person of an anti-doping rule violation charge that carries an asserted period of Ineligibility of four (4) or more years (including any period of Ineligibility asserted under Rule 10.4), if the Athlete or other Person admits the violation and accepts the asserted period of Ineligibility no later than 20 days after receiving the Notice of Charge, the Athlete or other Person may receive a one (1) year reduction in the period of Ineligibility asserted by the Integrity Unit. Where the Athlete or other Person receives the one (1) year reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility under this Rule 10.8.1, no further reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility will be allowed under any other Rule.”

73. The AIU issued a Notice of Charge to the Athlete on 12 June 2024. On 26 June 2024, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete confirming that he admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the asserted period of Ineligibility of eight (8) years.
74. The Athlete shall therefore receive a one (1) year reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR based on an early admission and acceptance of sanction.
75. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR, Rule 2.2 ADR and Rule 2.5 ADR, in accordance with Rule 10.2.1 ADR, Rule 10.3.1 ADR, Rule 10.9.3 ADR, and by application of Rule 10.8.1 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:
- 75.1. a period of Ineligibility of seven (7) years commencing on 16 July 2022 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and
- 75.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 23 May 2022, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any medals, titles, awards, points, prizes, prize money and appearance money.
76. The Athlete has accepted the above Consequences for his Anti-Doping Rule Violations and has expressly waived his right to have those Consequences determined by the Disciplinary Tribunal at a hearing.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

78. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
79. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, WADA and the Anti-Doping Agency of Kenya ("**ADAK**") 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.
80. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or ADAK, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise his right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 2 July 2024