

---

# Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Morine Gesare Michira

---

## 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 Morine Gesare Michira (“the **Athlete**”) is a 22-year-old long-distance runner from Kenya<sup>1</sup>.
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*

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/kenya/maureen-gesare-14892181>

[...]

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

5. On 23 March 2025, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition in Milan, Italy, which was given code 1534196 (the "**Sample**").
6. On 10 April 2025, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited laboratory in Ghent, Belgium (the "**Laboratory**") reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Sample based on the presence of Higenamine and Octodrine (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 Higenamine or Octodrine 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 15 April 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 her 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 17 April 20225 the Athlete provided her explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding, which, in summary, set out that she had used supplements and enclosed pictures of three (3) different supplements (1) ABE Ultimate Pre Workout, (2) XTEND 7G BCAA and (3) Zero Stim Pump Pre Workout 3G.
10. On 23 April 2025 the Athlete wrote to the AIU stating that she had "*seen the ingredients higenamine in the supplement I used during the race*" and claimed that she had no intention of violating the anti-doping rules. The Athlete attached a photo of the ingredients from a supplement (different to the supplements that she had identified in her e-mail on 17 April 2025) which listed as ingredients Higenamine and 2-aminoisoheptane Hydrochloride, which is a synonym for Octodrine/1,5 DMHA.
11. In a WhatsApp conversation with an AIU representative on 23 April 2025, the Athlete provided additional information in relation to the above supplement which was identified as CONDEMNED CONVICT High Stim Pre Workout which the Athlete asserted had been purchased from a shop in Milan on 21 March 2025.
12. The Athlete confirmed that she had mixed one serving (2 scoops) of this supplement with 800ml water and drank half of the water approximately 40 minutes before the start of the

marathon and then the remainder just before the start of the marathon itself (around 07:30 - 08:00AM) on 23 March 2025.

13. According to the ingredients list for the CONDEMNED CONVICT High Stim Pre Workout supplement, one serving (2 scoops) contains 50mg Higenamine and 225mg of 2-aminoisoheptane Hydrochloride (Octodrine).
14. The AIU obtained an independent scientific expert opinion from Prof. Martial Saugy, the former Director of the WADA-accredited laboratory in Lausanne, Switzerland in relation to the quantity of Higenamine and Octodrine ingested by the Athlete on the morning of the marathon. According to Prof. Saugy, the estimated concentrations of Higenamine (75ng/mL) and Octodrine (4.758ug/mL) in the Sample is potentially consistent with Athlete's asserted ingestion (when considering inter-individual variability).
15. The AIU therefore remained satisfied that the Athlete had committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations as set out in the Rules and, on 26 June 2025, issued the Athlete with a Notice of Charge ("the **Charge**") in accordance with Rule 8.5.1 and Article 7.1 ISRM, including the imposition of a Provisional Suspension pending determination of the matter in accordance with Rule 7.4.2.
16. On 8 July 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete via WhatsApp noting that the Charge had been issued to her via e-mail on 26 June 2025 and reminded her that she had until no later than 10 July 2025 to respond to the Charge indicating how she wanted to proceed with the matter.
17. On 10 July 2025, the Athlete wrote to the AIU via WhatsApp and confirmed that she waived her right to a hearing, admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences set out in the Charge. However, the Athlete included a plea that the proposed period of Ineligibility be reduced based on the circumstances of her case and her "*cooperative behaviour throughout the process*".
18. On 18 July 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete by WhatsApp and confirmed its understanding was that the Athlete admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences set out in the Charge. The AIU also confirmed that it did not agree to the Athlete's request to reduce the period of Ineligibility and stated that unless the Athlete informed the AIU that its understanding of her position was incorrect, then the AIU would proceed by issuing a final decision in her case.
19. The Athlete did not respond to the message from the AIU.

## Consequences

20. This is the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
21. 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.”*
22. Higenamine is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2025 Prohibited List under the category S3 Beta-2 Agonists. It is a Specified Substance prohibited at all times.
23. Octodrine is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2025 Prohibited List under the category S6B Specified Stimulants. It is a Specified Substance prohibited In Competition.
24. 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.
25. 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.
26. 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:
- 26.1. a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years commencing on 26 June 2025; and
- 26.2. disqualification of the Athlete’s results on and since 23 March 2025, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

## Publication

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

## Rights of Appeal

28. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
29. 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.
30. 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, 22 July 2025