Athletics Integrity Unit

1st Floor
6 Quai Antoine 1er
MC 98007, Monaco

Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Nancy Jelagat Meto

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**"; "the **Rules**") 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. Ms Nancy Jelagat Meto ("the **Athlete**") is a 40-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/nancy-jelagat-14776372

[…]

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

5. On 12 June 2024, the Athlete provided a urine Sample, Out-of-Competition in Iten, Kenya, pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of the Anti-Doping Agency of Kenya ("**ADAK**"), which was given code 8022570 (the "**Sample**").

6. As of 12 June 2024, the Athlete was a member of the International Registered Testing Pool, and she was therefore an International-Level Athlete as defined in the Kenya Anti-Doping Act ("**the Act**")[2] and the Rules[3].

7. On 10 July 2024, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited laboratory in Lausanne, Switzerland (the "**Laboratory**") reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Sample to ADAK based on the presence of Furosemide (the "**Adverse Analytical Finding**").

8. In accordance with Article 7.2 of the Act, ADAK 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 for the Furosemide 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 22 July 2024, ADAK issued the Athlete with an Anti-Doping Rule Violation Notice in relation to the Adverse Analytical Finding and imposed a Provisional Suspension effective 11 August 2024.

---

[2] The Act defines an "international-level athlete" as an athlete who competes in sport at the international level, as defined by each international federation, consistent with the International Standard for Testing and Investigations;

[3] "*1.4.4 Within the overall pool of Athletes set out above who are bound by and required to comply with these Anti-Doping Rules, each of the following Athletes at the relevant time shall be considered to be an International-Level Athlete ("International-Level Athlete") for the purposes of these Anti-Doping Rules and therefore the specific provisions in these Anti-Doping Rules applicable to International-Level Athletes (e.g., Testing, TUEs, whereabouts and Results Management) shall apply to such Athletes:*

(a) *An Athlete who is in the International Registered Testing Pool as published from time to time on the Integrity Unit website: https://www.athleticsintegrity.org/know-the-process/registered-testing-pool; […]*"

10. Having noted that the Athlete was an International Level Athlete, ADAK requested the AIU to accept delegated responsibility for Results Management for the Athlete's case[4]. On 3 July 2024, the AIU agreed to accept delegated authority for Results Management.

11. Following confirmation from ADAK that the Athlete had not responded to the Anti-Doping Rule Violation Notice, on 21 August 2024, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Charge and invited her to respond indicating how she would like to proceed with her case by no later than 4 September 2024.

12. On 30 August 2024, the Athlete replied to the Notice of Charge issued by the AIU. In summary, she disputed that she had received the Anti-Doping Rule Violation Notice issued by ADAK on 22 July 2024 and maintained that she had been denied procedural fairness and that she had been prejudiced.

13. Although the Athlete requested a hearing, she disputed that she was subject to the ADR on the basis that the Sample was collected under the Testing Authority of ADAK and that the applicable rules (and associated procedures) were therefore those of ADAK.

14. On 10 September 2024, the AIU responded to the Athlete, disputing that she had not received the Anti-Doping Rule Violation Notice sent by ADAK because it had been sent to the same e-mail address from which she had written to the AIU on 30 August 2024.

15. Moreover, the AIU clarified that ADAK had delegated its authority for Results Management to the AIU and that the AIU therefore had full authority to conduct Results Management in relation to the Adverse Analytical Finding, including a hearing before the Disciplinary Tribunal ("the **Tribunal**").

16. On 16 September 2024, the Athlete wrote to the AIU and, in addition to the matters raised in her response of 30 August 2024, she confirmed that she would contest the jurisdiction of the Tribunal.

17. Following review of the Athlete's responses, on 23 September 2024, and strictly without prejudice to any (further) actions that the AIU might take against her under the Rules, the AIU referred the matter back to ADAK for completion of Results Management[5].

18. On 26 September 2025, ADAK informed the AIU that following a decision on a preliminary objection issued by the national-level tribunal in Kenya (the Sports Disputes Tribunal, "**SDT**") dated 27 February 2025 with reference SDTADK E062 of 2024), the Athlete had submitted an application for judicial review of that decision to the High Court (Nairobi), which had decided (in a decision dated 8 August 2025 ("the **Kenyan High Court Decision**") that the SDT did not have jurisdiction to determine matters concerning International-Level Athletes and made orders, *inter alia*, (i) quashing the ADAK decision and/or notice to charge dated 2 September 2024 and the SDT proceedings and decision in SDTADK E062 of 2024, and all consequential decisions and/or directions arising therefrom, and (ii) prohibiting the SDT from carrying out

[4] In accordance with S7(3) of the Act and Article 7 of the World Anti-Doping Code.

[5] The AIU informed the Athlete of its decision by e-mail dated 4 October 2024.

and/or continuing any proceedings against the Athlete in relation to the notice to charge dated 2 September 2024[6].

19. In light of the Kenyan High Court Decision and the consequential delay in the Results Management of the Athlete's case, on 14 January 2026, and in accordance with Article 7.1.5 of the 2021 World Anti-Doping Code, WADA directed the AIU to conduct Results Management in this matter.

20. Therefore, on 18 February 2026, the AIU wrote to the Athlete explaining the above and confirmed its position being that although the Kenyan High Court Decision quashed ADAK's decision/notice to charge dated 2 September 2024, ADAK's (prior) decision to delegate its authority for Results Management, the Anti-Doping Rule Violation Notice issued by ADAK and the Notice of Charge issued by the AIU were unaffected by the Kenyan High Court Decision.

21. The AIU confirmed that on 12 June 2024, the Athlete was a member of the International Registered Testing Pool and was therefore an International-Level Athlete as defined in the Rules, and strictly subject to the Rules pursuant to Rule 1.4.2(f) ADR.

22. Furthermore, the AIU also confirmed that, as an Athlete included in the International Registered Testing Pool, the Athlete was deemed to have agreed to be bound by the Rules and to the jurisdiction of the Tribunal pursuant to Rule 1.4.3 of the Rules[7].

23. The AIU provided the Athlete with (a further) opportunity to request the B Sample analysis and to request copies of the Laboratory Documentation Packages supporting the Adverse Analytical Finding. The Athlete was also asked to confirm how she wished to proceed with her case and was given the opportunity to accept the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and the proposed Consequences or request a hearing before the Tribunal.

24. On 13 March 2026, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete.

Consequences

25. This is the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.

26. 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:

---

[6] The AIU understands that ADAK has notified the High Court of its intent to appeal the Kenyan High Court Decision.

[7] "*1.4.3 Each of the Persons covered by Rule 1.4.2 is deemed, as a condition of their membership, accreditation, participation, employment and/or involvement in the sport, to have agreed to be bound by these Anti-Doping Rules, and to have submitted to the authority of the Integrity Unit to enforce these Anti-Doping Rules on behalf of World Athletics, including any Consequences for breach thereof, and (with the exception of World Athletics' employees) to the jurisdiction of the hearing panels identified below to hear and determine cases and appeals brought under these Anti-Doping Rules.*"

"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."

27. Furosemide is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2024 Prohibited List under the category S5: Diuretics and Masking Agents. It is a Specified Substance prohibited at all times.

28. 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.

29. 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.

30. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR, in accordance with Rule 10.2.1 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:

    30.1. a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years commencing on 11 August 2024; and

    30.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results since 12 June 2024, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

31. The Athlete has accepted the above Consequences for her Anti-Doping Rule Violations and has expressly waived her right to have those Consequences determined by the Tribunal at a hearing.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

33. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.

34. 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.

1st Floor
6 Quai Antoine 1er
MC 98007, Monaco

35. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or ADAK, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise her right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 17 March 2026