
Public Disclosure of disposition of anti-doping matter in accordance with Rule 14.3.2 – Nathalia Kholodilina

1. On 13 September 2014, Ms Nathalia Kholodilina (“the **Athlete**”)¹ was subject to a urine doping control (the “**September 2014 Sample**”). The September 2014 Sample returned an adverse analytical finding for Metenolone².
2. On 1 October 2015, the Athlete was found to have committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation (“**ADRV**”) in relation to the September 2014 Sample and received a period of Ineligibility of two years from 22 September 2014 until 21 September 2016 (included), with Disqualification of results from 13 September 2014 until 22 September 2014.
3. World Athletics³ subsequently came into possession of the Laboratory Information Management System (“**LIMS**”) data of the WADA-accredited Moscow Laboratory that indicated that, on 6 June 2014, the Athlete had been subject to an earlier urine doping control (the “**June 2014 Sample**”) which also contained Metenolone.
4. On 28 May 2024, the Athletics Integrity Unit (“**AIU**”)⁴ notified the Athlete of a potential ADRV pursuant to Rule 32.2(b) of the 2014-2015 IAAF Competition Rules in relation to the June 2014 Sample.
5. On 6 December 2024, the Athlete was issued a Notice of Charge.
6. On 7 November 2025, in circumstances where the Athlete had failed to respond to the Notice of Charge, the AIU issued a decision finding that the Athlete had committed an ADRV in relation to the June 2014 Sample, and imposing an additional period of Ineligibility of two years (based on aggravating circumstances), with Disqualification of the Athlete’s results from 6 June 2014 until 13 September 2014 (the “**Appealed Decision**”).
7. On 25 November 2025, the Athlete filed an appeal against the Appealed Decision to the National Center for Sports Arbitration (the “**NCSA Appeal**”)⁵.

¹ <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/russia/natalya-kholodilina-14388774>

² Metenolone is an exogenous anabolic androgenic steroid prohibited under Section S1.1A of the 2014 WADA Prohibited List.

³ Formerly known as the International Association of Athletics Federations (the “**IAAF**”).

⁴ On behalf of World Athletics.

⁵ For the avoidance of doubt, it was the AIU’s position that NCSA did not have jurisdiction over this matter and that any appeal should have been filed with the Court of Arbitration for Sport which has exclusive jurisdiction per Rule 13.2.1 in cases involving International-Level Athletes.

8. The AIU, the Athlete and the World Anti-Doping Agency (the "**Parties**") subsequently entered into a Case Resolution Agreement in accordance with Rule 10.8.2 of the World Athletics Anti-Doping Rules ("**ADR**") pursuant to which:
 - 8.1. the Athlete admitted to having committed an ADRV pursuant to Rule 32.2(b) of the 2014-2015 IAAF Competition Rules in relation to the June 2014 Sample;
 - 8.2. the Parties agreed that no additional period of Ineligibility was to be imposed on the Athlete under the applicable IAAF Competition Rules based on aggravating circumstances; and
 - 8.3. All competitive results of the Athlete from (and including) 6 June 2014 until 13 September 2014 were disqualified with all resulting consequences, including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes.
9. The disposition of the Athlete's case is now final under the ADR and is published in accordance with Rule 14.3.2 ADR⁶.

Monaco, 13 February 2026

⁶ For the avoidance of doubt, the Appealed Decision is set aside and the NCSA Appeal has been terminated accordingly.