
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Judy Jelagat Kemboi

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 Judy Jelagat Kemboi ("the **Athlete**") is a 26-year-old long-distance runner from Kenya; at the time of this Decision, she is currently ranked #7 in the World in Women's Road Running¹.
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)."*

¹ <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/kenya/judy-jelagat-kemboi-15112956>

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

[...]

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

5. On 8 April 2025, the Athlete provided a urine Sample Out-of-Competition in Kenya, which was given code 8160946 (the “**Sample**”).
6. On 2 May 2025, the World Anti-Doping Agency (“**WADA**”) accredited laboratory in Lausanne, Switzerland (the “**Laboratory**”) reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Sample based on the presence of hydrochlorothiazide (“**HCTZ**”)² (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 HCTZ 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 27 May 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 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. The notification from the AIU also invited the Athlete to provide her explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding by way of interview with AIU representatives on either 3 June 2025 or 4 June 2025.
10. On 3 June 2025, the Athlete attended an interview with AIU representatives (the Athlete's Authorised Athlete Representative also attended the interview) and provided her explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding, including that she had attended a medical centre/clinic in Eldoret for treatment in April 2025 and given several medications.

² The Laboratory confirmed the estimated concentration of HCTZ in the Sample as being 3,200ng/mL (3.2µg/mL).

11. Following interview, and upon request of AIU representatives, the Athlete provided the AIU with copies of medical documents relating to her treatment including (i) a medical prescription from the medical centre/clinic dated 3 April 2025 for medicines prescribed to her, (ii) medical notes dated 3 April 2025 relating to her treatment at the the medical centre/clinic (iii) an Official Receipt from the the medical centre/clinic for a payment of 3,500 Kenyan Shillings made on 3 April 2025.
12. The Athlete also provided the AIU with several pictures of the medicines that she had taken and of the container of a supplement ABE (All Black Everything) Ultimate Pre-Workout.
13. On 9 June 2025, the Athlete confirmed that she wished for the medicines that she had retained in her possession to be analysed for the presence of HCTZ (at her own cost).
14. On 2 July 2025, the Athlete provided the remainder of those medicines into the custody of representatives of the Anti-Doping Agency of Kenya (“**ADAK**”) for transfer to the WADA-accredited laboratory in Seibersdorf, Austria (“the **Seibersdorf Laboratory**”), for analysis for the presence of HCTZ.
15. On 5 August 2025, the Seibersdorf Laboratory confirmed that its analysis of the medicines provided by the Athlete had not revealed the presence of HCTZ.
16. The AIU therefore remained satisfied that the Athlete had committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations as set out in the Rules and, on 6 August 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.
17. On 7 August 2025, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete.

Consequences

18. This is the Athlete’s first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
19. 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.”*

20. HCTZ is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2025 Prohibited List under the category S5. Diuretics. It is a Specified Substance prohibited at all times.
21. 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.
22. 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.
23. 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:
- 23.1. a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years commencing on 6 August 2025; and
- 23.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 8 April 2025, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

25. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
26. 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.
27. 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, 11 August 2025