
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Sheila Chebet

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. Ms Sheila Chebet (“the **Athlete**”) is a 27-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/sheila-chebet-14859954>

[...]

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 25 August 2024, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition at the NMDC Hyderabad Marathon held in Hyderabad, India, which was given code 655363 (the “**Sample**”).
6. On 3 October 2024, the World Anti-Doping Agency (“**WADA**”) accredited laboratory in New Delhi, India (the “**Laboratory**”) reported that the analysis of the Sample had revealed the presence of Tramadol (“the **Adverse Analytical Finding**”).
7. The AIU reviewed the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5 of the ISRM and determined that:
 - 7.1. the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption (“**TUE**”) that had been granted (or that would be granted) for the Tramadol found in the Sample; and
 - 7.2. 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.
8. On 8 October 2024, in accordance with Article 5 of the International Standard for Results Management (“**ISRM**”) the AIU therefore issued the Athlete with a Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations which notified the Athlete of the Adverse Analytical Finding and invited her to provide an explanation by no later than 15 October 2024.
9. On 9 October 2024, the Athlete provided a prescription from a Dental Clinic in Kapsabet (the “**Dental Clinic**”) to the AIU².
10. On 10 October 2024, the AIU wrote to the Athlete explaining that the prescription from the Dental Clinic was illegible and asked her to submit a clearer copy and to provide a detailed explanation of the circumstances surrounding her visit to the Dental Clinic (including the date of the visit, the name of the treating dentist, and the name of the medication prescribed).
11. On 11 October 2024, the Athlete provided a more legible version of the prescription from the Dental Clinic, according to which she was treated at the Dental Clinic on 13 July 2024.

² On the same day, the Athlete also wrote to the AIU via WhatsApp stating that: “*I'm not understand which medicine wrong with me*”.

12. On 15 October 2024, the AIU wrote to the Athlete to inform her that, upon review, none of the medications listed on the prescription from the Dental Clinic was, or contained, Tramadol.
13. On 16 October 2024, the Athlete sent the AIU a new document, being a medical record entitled 'Patient's record book' which appeared to have been issued by the Kapsabet County Referral Hospital (the "**Hospital**") on 15 July 2024 (in that it bore the Hospital's stamp), according to which the Athlete was prescribed *inter alia* Tramamed³ (50mg).
14. On 17 October 2024, the AIU asked the Athlete to provide, by 28 October 2024, (i) her full medical file from the Dental Clinic and the Hospital, (ii) a detailed account of the circumstances of her visits to the Dental Clinic and the Hospital respectively, and (iii) details regarding her purchase and use of Tramadol.
15. On 20 October 2024, the Athlete sent a photo of an empty tablet of Tramamed (showing 4 pills were missing) and stated that she had used the medication because her mouth had swollen following her tooth extraction.
16. On 21 October 2024, the AIU acknowledged receipt of what the Athlete had provided and reminded her of the deadline of 28 October 2024 to respond with the information that the AIU requested in its email of 17 October 2024.
17. On 24 October 2024, the Athlete informed the AIU that she was waiting for her husband to obtain the receipt from the chemist as he was the one who had purchased the medication.
18. On 25 and 27 October 2024, the Athlete wrote to the AIU asking for forgiveness.
19. On 4 November 2024, the AIU requested assistance from ADAK to determine the veracity of the Athlete's asserted medical treatment at the Hospital and the authenticity of the medical document submitted by the Athlete.
20. On 11 November 2024, ADAK confirmed that they could assist AIU with this enquiry.
21. On 14 November 2024, the AIU interviewed the Athlete⁴ (the "**First Interview**"). In summary, the Athlete stated *inter alia* that:
 - 21.1. she visited the Dental Clinic on 13 July 2024 as she was experiencing a toothache and received two (2) injections for the pain and her tooth was removed;
 - 21.2. on 15 July 2024, as the Athlete was still experiencing pain and her jaw had started to swell, she called her husband and asked him to bring her pain medication;
 - 21.3. her husband then brought back medication including Tramadol but could not remember where he had purchased the medication from;

³ A brand name for Tramadol

⁴ The Athlete was provided with swahili interpretation.

- 21.4. she did not visit the Hospital on 15 July 2024;
- 21.5. she had taken two (2) Tramamed (50mg) pills in total, one on 15 July 2024 and one on 16 July 2024 and disposed of the other two pills in the waste;
- 21.6. after the AIU requested medical documents related to her use of Tramadol, she asked her husband who told her that there was a receipt in the house, so she searched the house and found the medical record from the Hospital which she provided to the AIU.
22. On 19 December 2024, the AIU imposed a Provisional Suspension upon the Athlete with immediate effect.
23. The AIU requested an independent scientific opinion from Prof. Martial Saugy, the former Director of the WADA-accredited laboratory in Lausanne, Switzerland, in relation to the estimated concentration of Tramadol in the Athlete's Sample on 25 August 2024 (44.8ug/mL) and the Athlete's asserted ingestion of a total of two Tramamed tablets, one on 15 July 2024 and another on 16 July 2024.
24. On 13 January 2025, Prof. Saugy confirmed that, in his expert opinion, "*the estimated concentration of Tramadol in the Athlete's Sample (44.8µg/mL) collected on 25 August 2024 is totally inconsistent with the Athlete's asserted last ingestion of Tramadol over one month before the urine collection.*"
25. On 17 January 2025, ADAK forwarded a formal response from the Hospital, which confirmed that:
- 25.1. their records showed that the Athlete had attended the Hospital on 22 October 2024 (i.e., shortly after she had received the Notice of Allegation on 8 October 2024) and on 5 December 2024; and
- 25.2. there were no records indicating that the Athlete had received any medical treatment or had been prescribed any medications at the Hospital on 15 July 2024; and
- 25.3. the medical document dated 15 July 2024 submitted by the Athlete to the AIU was not issued by the Hospital.
26. Due to the discrepancies between the medical document submitted by the Athlete and the information provided by the Hospital (in particular, that there were no records indicating that the Athlete had ever received any medical treatment on 15 July 2024 at the Hospital and that the medical document submitted by the Athlete was not issued by the Hospital), the AIU considered that there was compelling evidence that the medical document submitted by the Athlete had been falsified and/or was not authentic.
27. On 24 January 2025, the AIU therefore conducted a follow-up interview with the Athlete. (the "**Second Interview**"). The Athlete was confronted with the information in the Hospital's response and the AIU put it to the Athlete that the medical document that she had submitted was forged/falsified.
28. The Athlete did not admit that the medical document was forged/falsified and maintained her version of events as reported during the First Interview, namely, that the document in question had been provided to her by her husband. When asked why she had sent the AIU a document from the Hospital which she had not visited on 15 July 2024, the Athlete stated that

she did not look at the document in detail and simply wanted to send it to the AIU by the deadline.

29. The AIU remained satisfied that the Athlete had committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR, Rule 2.2 ADR and concluded that the Athlete had also committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.5 ADR (Tampering or Attempted Tampering with any part of Doping Control by an Athlete).
30. Therefore, on 2 July 2025, 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 she was being charged with Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR, Rule 2.2 ADR and Rule 2.5 ADR (“the **Charge**”) and that those Anti-Doping Rule Violations warranted a total period of Ineligibility of six (6) years pursuant to Rules 10.2.1(b) ADR and 10.9.3(c) ADR (i.e., two (2) years for the Presence/Use of a Specified Substance and four (4) years for Tampering or Attempted Tampering to be served consecutively).
31. The Athlete was informed *inter alia* of her right to request a hearing and given the opportunity to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations to potentially benefit from a one-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR. The AIU invited the Athlete to respond to the Charge confirming how she wished to proceed by no later than 16 July 2025.
32. On 13 July 2025, the Athlete wrote to the AIU by e-mail stating “*I apologize and accept all the consequences*”.

Consequences

33. 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 pursuant to Rule 10.9.3 ADR.
34. 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.”

35. Tramadol is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2024 Prohibited List under the category S7 - Narcotics. It is a Specified Substance prohibited In-Competition.

36. The period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years, unless the AIU demonstrates that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were intentional.
37. 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.
38. In addition, Rule 10.3.1 ADR specifies the period of Ineligibility to be imposed for a breach of Rule 2.5 (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.”

39. 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.
40. Rule 10.9.3(c) 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.*

41. The Athlete committed the violation of Rule 2.5 ADR in connection with the Doping Control Process (specifically during Results Management of the Adverse Analytical Finding) and therefore falls squarely within this provision. The violation of Rule 2.5 ADR shall therefore be treated as a stand alone first violation and the four (4)-year period of Ineligibility must be served consecutively to the two (2)-year period of Ineligibility imposed for the violations of Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR (i.e., a total period of Ineligibility of six (6) years).

42. 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.”

43. A Notice of Charge was issued to the Athlete on 2 July 2025. On 13 July 2025, the Athlete confirmed that she admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the asserted period of Ineligibility of six (6) years.
44. 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.
45. 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 10.2.2 ADR and Rule 10.9.3(c) ADR and the application of Rule 10.8.1 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:
- 45.1. a period of Ineligibility of five (5) years commencing on 19 December 2024 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and
 - 45.2. disqualification of the Athlete’s results on and since 25 August 2024, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any medals, titles, awards, points, prizes, prize money and appearance money.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

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

48. 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.
49. 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, 23 July 2025