

---

# Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Citlali Cristian Moscote

---

## 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 Citlali Cristian Moscote ("the **Athlete**") is a 30-year-old road runner from Mexico<sup>1</sup>.
3. This matter concerns the Athlete's second Anti-Doping Rule Violation<sup>2</sup>.
4. 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

5. Rule 2 ADR sets out that the following shall constitute an Anti-Doping Rule Violation:

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/mexico/citlali-cristian-moscote-14756134>

<sup>2</sup> The Athlete has previously been found to have committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations based upon the presence of Oxilofrine and Phenpromethamine in a Sample collected from her on 7 April 2019.

*“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”*

6. On 12 January 2025, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition at the ‘10K Valencia Ibercaja by Kiprun’, held in Valencia, Spain, which was given code 8081766 (the “**Sample**”) pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of World Athletics – AIU.
7. On 3 February 2025, the WADA-accredited laboratory in Barcelona, Spain (the “**Laboratory**”) reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Sample based on the presence of Octodrine<sup>3</sup> and its metabolite Heptaminol (the “**Adverse Analytical Finding**”).
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 Octodrine (or its metabolite) found in the Sample; and
  - 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.
9. Therefore, on 6 February 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.
10. 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 and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR<sup>4</sup> by 13 February 2025.
11. On 13 February 2025, the Athlete wrote to the AIU and stated that she did not intentionally use Octodrine and believed that the Adverse Analytical Finding was caused by a Contaminated Product. The Athlete stated that she therefore wished to have supplements analysed.

---

<sup>3</sup> A Specified Substance according to the WADA 2025 Prohibited List, also known as 1,5-dimethylhexylamine.

<sup>4</sup> Although this matter concerns the presence of Octodrine (and its Metabolite), which is a Specified Substance for which the applicable period of Ineligibility is normally two (2) years, since this matter concerns the Athlete’s second Anti-Doping Rule Violation, the applicable period of Ineligibility in her case is four (4) years (as explained further below) and the Athlete may therefore benefit from the application of Rule 10.8.1 ADR.

12. On 18 February 2025, the Athlete sent the AIU information regarding a laboratory in the USA where she wished to have her supplements analysed.
13. On 19 February 2025, the AIU noted<sup>5</sup> that the Athlete wished to have supplements analysed and asked her to provide the following by no later than 26 February 2025:
  - 13.1. confirmation of which laboratory would analyse her supplements and the timeframe for the analysis<sup>6</sup>; and
  - 13.2. information in relation to each supplement that she had used prior to the race on 12 January 2025<sup>7</sup>.
14. On 26 February 2025, the Athlete provided the requested information regarding two (2) supplements, (namely (i) Cafeina BHP Nutrition and (ii) Perpetuem Ultra Endurance Fuel 2.0 Hammer Nutrition) and confirmed that she would proceed with the analysis of the products at the laboratory in the USA<sup>8</sup>.
15. On 10 March 2025, the Athlete wrote to the AIU and confirmed that arrangements for the analysis of her supplements had been finalised with the laboratory in the USA on 4 March 2025 and that she had shipped the supplements on 7 March 2025.
16. On 18 March 2025, the Athlete confirmed that the shipment had arrived at the laboratory in the USA on 17 March 2025 after some delays due to customs-related issues.
17. On 24 March 2025, the AIU imposed a Provisional Suspension upon the Athlete pending resolution of her case.
18. On 23 April, 5 May and 9 May 2025, the AIU asked the Athlete to provide an update regarding the testing of her supplements by the laboratory in the USA.
19. On 16 May 2025, the Athlete wrote to the AIU from a new email address and stated that:

---

<sup>5</sup> The AIU also noted that the Athlete had not requested her B Sample analysis within the given deadline and confirmed that she was therefore deemed to have irrevocably waived her right to the B Sample analysis in accordance with the ISRM.

<sup>6</sup> The AIU confirmed to the Athlete in this regard that she could get her supplement(s) tested at the laboratory in the USA (or any reputable laboratory) so long as the laboratory confirmed that they were able to detect and quantify the substance Octodrine in supplements and could conduct analysis in a reasonable timeframe.

<sup>7</sup> in particular (i) photos of its packaging and label (including the ingredient list); (ii) photos of the remaining product (powder, pills,...), (iii) the quantity of the remaining product, (iv) how she declared the supplement on the doping control form, (v) why she bought this supplement, (vi) a detailed account of how she used the supplement (dates of first use, last use prior to the race, dosage, frequency, etc) and (vii) the name of the store/pharmacy/website where she bought the supplement and any receipt/proof of purchase she might have in her possession.

<sup>8</sup> The Athlete explained that the analysis should require about twenty (20) days.

- 19.1. she apologized for the delay in responding to the AIU explaining that the email address that had been used so far in the proceedings was blocked and she could not access it at the moment;
  - 19.2. due to her lack of financial means, she had only sent one supplement, Caffeine Ultra BHP Nutriton for analysis by the laboratory in the USA and that analysis did not detect the presence of Octodrine<sup>9</sup>;
  - 19.3. she had contacted Hammer NutriPon about the other supplement she had used, Perpetuem Ultra Endurance Fuel 2.0, and was informed that the product was tested and certified to be free of prohibited substances.
  - 19.4. although she did not know how Octodrine had entered her body and asserted that she had not acted intentionally, she nevertheless accepted that she had committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations under the Rules.
20. On 20 May 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete and confirmed that, following review of her explanation and supporting evidence, the AIU remained satisfied that she had committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations and that the mandatory period of Ineligibility of four (4) years remained applicable in her case<sup>10</sup>. The AIU reminded the Athlete that she could admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accept the mandatory Consequences at that stage, in which case the period of Ineligibility of four (4) years would be automatically reduced by one (1) year under Rule 10.8.1 ADR.
21. On 26 May 2025, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete.

## Consequences

22. This constitutes the Athlete's second Anti-Doping Rule Violation in accordance with Rule 10.9.3(a).
23. The Athlete has previously been sanctioned with a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years starting on 23 July 2019 for the presence of Oxilofrine and Phenpromethamine, in a Sample that was collected from the Athlete on 7 April 2019.
24. 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:*

---

<sup>9</sup> The Athlete provided a copy of the laboratory test report.

<sup>10</sup> *ibid* footnote 3.

- (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.:"*

25. Octodrine is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2025 Prohibited List under the category S6: Stimulants. It is a Specified Substance prohibited In-Competition.
26. As set out above, this constitutes the Athlete's second Anti-Doping Rule Violation. In accordance with Rule 10.9.1(a), the period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore **a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years**<sup>11</sup>.
27. 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."*

---

<sup>11</sup> The period of Ineligibility for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.1/Rule 2.2 involving a Specified substance is a period of two (2) years in accordance with Rule 10.2.2. In accordance with Rule 10.9.1(a) the period of Ineligibility for a second Anti-Doping Rule Violation shall be in the range between (i) the sum of the period of Ineligibility imposed for the first Anti-Doping Rule Violation (2 years) plus the period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable to the second Anti-Doping Rule Violation treated as if it were a first violation (2 years) (i.e., a total of 4 years), and (ii) twice the period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable to the second Anti-Doping Rule Violation treated as if it were a first violation (i.e., 2 x 2 years = 4 years).

28. The Notice of Allegation was issued to the Athlete on 6 February 2025, and, on 26 May 2025, the Athlete returned a signed Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form confirming that she admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the asserted period of Ineligibility<sup>12</sup>.
29. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR and accepted the Consequences specified by the AIU, in accordance with Rules 10.2 and 10.9.1(a) ADR and the application of Rule 10.8.1 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for the Athlete's second Anti-Doping Rule Violation:
- 29.1. a period of Ineligibility of three (3) years commencing on 24 March 2025 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and
- 29.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 12 January 2025, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.
30. The Athlete has accepted the above Consequences for her Anti-Doping Rule Violations and has expressly waived her right to have those Consequences determined by the Disciplinary Tribunal at a hearing.

## Publication

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

## Rights of Appeal

32. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
33. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, the Athlete, WADA and the Comisión Nacional de Cultura Física y Deporte ("CONADE") 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.
34. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or CONADE, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise her right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 10 June 2025

---

<sup>12</sup> The Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations was issued to the Athlete in accordance with Article 5.1.2 of the ISRM, prior to a Notice of Charge issued in accordance with Article 7 of the ISRM. Considering the Athlete's signed admission and acceptance of Consequences on 26 May 2025, no Notice of Charge was ever issued.