Athletics Integrity Unit

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

Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Mr Geoffrey Yegon

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 Geoffrey Yegon ("the **Athlete**") is a 36-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:

[1] https://worldathletics.org/athletes/kenya/geoffrey-yegon-14733386

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

[...]

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

5. On 1 December 2024, the Athlete provided a urine Sample, In-Competition at the Standard Chartered Singapore Marathon in Singapore, which was given code 1401407 (the "**Sample**").

6. On 2 January 2025, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited laboratory in Doha, Qatar (the "**Laboratory**") reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Sample based on the presence of Triamcinolone acetonide (the "**Adverse Analytical Finding**").

7. The AIU reviewed the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5 of the International Standard for Results Management ("**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 Triamcinolone acetonide 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. Therefore, on 7 January 2025, 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, 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

9. On 14 January 2025, the Athlete provided an explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding (reproduced in material part below) according to which he admitted the Use of Triamcinolone acetonide and accepted the finding in his Sample:

> "*After the race I gave out my urine sample for doping control test which I signed and was sealed on my presence,on 7th this month I received an email stating that my sample which I had given out after the race has turned to be positive of triamcinolone acetate a drug that I can confess I took unknowingly from the over counter drug chemist to treat a stubborn allergy that has been disturbing me for some time.considering that I didn't apply for Therapeutic use exemption (TUE) and I didn't seek information from relevant bodies to inquire about the drug before ingestion,And the consequences of it is that I'll be banned from any competitions and my results will be nullified.*
>
> *Since I have been competing in various competitions and winning cleanly and I have been a true advocate for clean sport,it wasn't my intention to dope to win the race I was just seeking medication and on the process I ingest a banned substance*

unknowingly and for that I apologise for mistake I did and I'll be keen on any medication henceforth."

10. On 15 January 2025, the AIU acknowledged receipt of the Athlete's reply and requested that he provide additional details regarding his use of Triamcinolone acetonide by 20 January 2025[2]. The Athlete failed to reply by that deadline.

11. Therefore, on 21 January 2025, the AIU extended the Athlete's deadline to provide the additional information requested by the AIU until 24 January 2025. The Athlete failed to reply by the extended deadline.

12. Following a review of the Athlete's explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding, the AIU remained satisfied that he had committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations. Therefore, on 11 February 2025, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Charge in accordance with Rule 8.5.1 ADR and Article 7.1 ISRM notifying him that (i) he was being charged with Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR ("**the Charge**"), that (ii) he was subject to a Provisional Suspension with immediate effect and that (iii) the Consequences that the AIU would seek included a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years and disqualification of his results since 1 December 2024[3].

13. The AIU invited the Athlete to respond to the Charge confirming how he wished to proceed by no later than 25 February 2025. The Athlete was informed that if he failed to respond by that deadlilne that he would be deemed to have waived his right to a hearing, admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences set out in the Charge.

14. On 25 February 2025, the AIU reminded the Athlete of his deadline to respond to the Charge, however, the Athlete failed to respond to the Charge within the given deadline.

15. Therefore, on 26 February 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete noting that he had failed to respond to the Charge within the given deadline and that he was therefore deemed to have waived his right to a hearing, admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences set out in the Notice of Charge. The AIU confirmed that it would issue a final decision in his case accordingly.

Consequences

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

---

[2] The Athlete was asked *inter alia* to (i) provide the name of the medication containing Triamcinolone acetonide he used (the "**Medication**"), (ii) confirm when and where he bought the Medication and how he used it, and (iii) provide more details regarding the allergies that he was allegedly suffering from, including the symptoms he was experiencing and any related medical documents/diagnoses.

[3] The AIU also noted that the Athlete had not requested the analysis of his B Sample within the given deadline and was therefore deemed to have waived his right to the B Sample analysis.

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

17. 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."*

18. 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[4] or rectal route.

19. 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.

20. 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.

21. On the basis that the Athlete is deemed to have 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:

    21.1. a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years commencing on 11 February 2025 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and

    21.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 1 December 2024, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

Publication

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

[4] Including oromucosal (e.g., buccal, gingival, sublingual).

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

Rights of Appeal

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

24. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, the Athlete, 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.

25. 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, 5 March 2025