

---

# Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Mr Elijah Kipkosgei

---

## 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 Elijah Kipkosgei ("the **Athlete**") is a 26-year-old road runner from Kenya.
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 an Anti-Doping Rule Violation

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*

5. On 24 November 2024, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition in the China-ASEAN International Marathon (a World Athletics Label Road Race) in Fangchenggang, China, which was given code 8040913 (the "**Sample**").

6. On 6 December 2024, the World Anti-Doping Agency (“**WADA**”) accredited laboratory in Beijing, China (the “**Laboratory**”) reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Sample based on the presence of Triamcinolone acetonide (the “**Adverse Analytical Finding**”).
7. Triamcinolone acetonide is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2024 Prohibited List under the category S9. Glucocorticoids. It is a Specified Substance prohibited In-Competition when administered by any injectable, oral<sup>1</sup> or rectal route.
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 Triamcinolone acetonide found in the Sample;
  - 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; and
  - 8.3. it was not apparent that the Adverse Analytical Finding was caused by an ingestion of the relevant Prohibited Substance through a permitted route.
9. Therefore, on 9 December 2024, the AIU notified the Athlete of the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 of the ISRM, including that the Adverse Analytical Finding may result in Anti-Doping Rule Violations pursuant to Rule 2.1 ADR and/or Rule 2.2 ADR.
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 by 16 December 2024.
11. On 12 December 2024, the Athlete wrote to the AIU by e-mail stating “*I. Never. Use. It*”.
12. On 19 December 2024, the AIU received a further e-mail from the Athlete in which he stated that the China-ASEAN International Marathon was his first international race, that he was shocked by the Adverse Analytical Finding and that he had no knowledge as to how Triamcinolone acetonide came to be present in the Sample, and “*had no plan to violate the antidoping rules*”.
13. Following a review of the Athlete’s responses, the AIU remained satisfied that the Athlete had committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation as set out in the Rules.
14. Therefore, on 20 December 2024, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Charge in accordance with Rule 8.5.1 and Article 7.1 ISRM confirming that he was being charged with an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.1 ADR (“the **Charge**”) and that a Provisional Suspension was imposed upon him with immediate effect. The Charge also specified that the Consequences included (i) a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years and (ii) disqualification of the Athlete’s results on and since 24 November 2024, and the AIU invited the Athlete to

---

<sup>1</sup> Including oromucosal (e.g., buccal, gingival, sublingual).

respond confirming how he wished to proceed with the Charge by no later than 3 January 2025.

15. On 21 December 2024, the AIU received an e-mail from the Athlete containing an incomplete response. Therefore, on 23 December 2024, the AIU replied to the Athlete informing him that his response was incomplete and asked him to resubmit his full response.
16. On 31 December 2024, the Athlete wrote to the AIU by e-mail maintaining that he had not acted intentionally and that he had no knowledge of how Triamcinolone acetonide came to be present in the Sample. The Athlete waived his right to a hearing (“*I am not willing to do any case and I am ready for any charges*”) and, in a second e-mail received on 31 December 2024, he also explained that “*i don't usually go to hospital rather i go to chemist to self medicate this might be where i got the banned item in my body without knowing*”.
17. On 3 January 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete noting his responses to the Charge (as set out above) and confirmed that it understood the Athlete’s position to be that that he did not dispute the Anti-Doping Rule Violation or require a hearing. The AIU invited the Athlete to confirm his position by signing and returning an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violation and Acceptance of Consequences Form to the AIU by no later than 10 January 2025. The AIU also informed the Athlete that if he failed to do so, then the AIU would be entitled to deem that he had admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violation and accepted the Consequences set out in the Charge.
18. The Athlete failed to respond by 10 January 2025.
19. Therefore, on 14 January 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete and provided him with a final opportunity to sign and return an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violation and Acceptance of Consequences Form to the AIU by no later than 17 January 2025. The AIU informed the Athlete that if he failed to do so, then he would be deemed to have admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violation and accepted the Consequences that were set out in the Charge.
20. The Athlete failed to respond by 17 January 2025.
21. Pursuant to the foregoing, the Athlete is deemed to have admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violation and accepted the Consequences specified in the Charge in accordance with Rule 8.5.2(f) ADR.

## Consequences

22. This is the Athlete’s first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
23. Rule 10.2 ADR specifies that the period of Ineligibility for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.1 or Rule 2.2 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.”*
- 24. Triamcinolone acetonide is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2024 Prohibited List under the category S9. Glucocorticoids. It is a Specified Substance prohibited In-Competition when administered by any injectable, oral or rectal route.
- 25. The period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore a period of two (2) years, unless the AIU demonstrates that the Anti-Doping Rule Violation was intentional.
- 26. The AIU has no evidence that the Anti-Doping Rule Violation was intentional and the mandatory period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore a period of two (2) years.
- 27. On the basis that the Athlete is deemed to have admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.1 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:
  - 27.1. a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years commencing on 20 December 2024; and
  - 27.2. disqualification of the Athlete’s results on and since 24 November 2024, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.
- 28. The Athlete is deemed to have accepted the above Consequences for his Anti-Doping Rule Violation and to have waived his right to have them determined by the Disciplinary Tribunal at a hearing.

## Publication

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

## Rights of Appeal

- 30. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
- 31. 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.
- 32. 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, 24 January 2025