Athletics Integrity Unit

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

Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Mr Charles Kipkkurui Langat

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 Charles Kipkkurui Langat ("the **Athlete**") is a 29-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:

> *"2.1 Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample*
>
> *[...]*

[1] https://worldathletics.org/athletes/kenya/charles-kipkkurui-langat-15041115

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

5. On 20 July 2024, the Athlete provided a urine Sample, Out-of-Competition in Iten, Kenya, which was given code 8098917 (the "**Sample**").

6. On 2 August 2024, following initial analysis, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited laboratory in Lausanne, Switzerland (the "**Laboratory**"), reported that the Sample was negative for the presence of any Prohibited Substances.

7. On 8 October 2024, the AIU issued a Decision[2] concerning (admitted) Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 and Rule 2.2 in relation to an Adverse Analytical Finding for Furosemide in a sample that had been collected from the Athlete on 6 August 2024 (the "**First Violation**") which imposed the following (accepted) Consequences:

   7.1. a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years commencing on 11 September 2024 (the date of his Provisional Suspension); and

   7.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results since 6 August 2024, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

8. On 14 July 2025, having conducted Further Analysis[3], the Laboratory in Lausanne reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Sample based on the presence of Testosterone and its Metabolites Androsterone, 5α-androstane-3α,17 diol ("**5αAdiol"**) and 5β-androstane-3α,17 diol ("**5βAdiol**") consistent with exogenous origin (the "**Adverse Analytical Finding**").

9. The AIU reviewed the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5 of the International Standard for Results Management ("**ISRM**") and determined that:

   9.1. the Athlete did not have a Therapeutic Use Exemption ("**TUE**") that had been granted (or that would be granted) for the exogeneous Testosterone and/or its Metabolites found in the Sample; and

   9.2. there was no apparent departure from the International Standard for Testing and Investigations ("**ISTI**") or from the ISL that could reasonably have caused the Adverse Analytical Finding.

10. Therefore, on 17 July 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 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

[2] Available on the AIU website (here)

[3] As defined in the WADA International Standard for Laboratories ("**ISL**").

Anti-Doping Rule Violations by no later than 24 July 2025. The Athlete was also requested to confirm his availability to attend an online interview with AIU representatives.

11. On 21 July 2025, the Athlete wrote to the AIU, denying the use of Testosterone and confirming his availability to attend an online interview with AIU representatives.

12. On 30 July 2025, the Athlete attended an interview with AIU representatives (the "**Interview**"), during which he stated, *inter alia*, that:

    12.1. he never took Testosterone;

    12.2. following a race in July 2023, he experienced knee and tendon injuries, general health decline, and hormonal imbalance. In this context, he was prescribed hydrocortisone and advised to take Furosemide;

    12.3. the Athlete suggestsed that hydrocortisone or Furosemide may have been responsible for the Adverse Analytical Finding.

13. On 21 August 2025, the Athlete was provided with an opportunity to provide any additional explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding and further supporting documents that he wished to rely upon by 28 August 2025. The Athlete was also reminded that, at this stage, he could still benefit from a one (1)-year reduction under Rule 10.8.1 ADR if he returned a completed Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form (enclosed with the Notice of Allegation) by 28 August 2025.

14. On the same day, 21 August 2025, the Athlete wrote to the AIU stating that he accepted the sanction. On 23 August 2025, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete.

Consequences

15. In accordance with Rule 10.9.3(a), the (admitted) First Violation, for which the Athlete is currently serving a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years (until 10 September 2026) and the alleged violations of Rule 2.1 and/or Rule 2.2 that are the subject of this decision, are to be considered together as the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation with the sanction based on the violation that carries the more severe sanction[4], including the application of Aggravating Circumstances.

16. 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:*

[4] In the Athlete's case, these were the Anti-Doping Rule Violations resulting from the Adverse Analytical Finding for Testosterone (and its Metabolites), a Non-Specified Substance.

(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-

17. Testosterone[5] is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2024 Prohibited List under the category S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids. It is a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times.

18. The period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years, unless the Athlete demonstrates that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional.

19. The Athlete has not demonstrated that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional. Therefore, the mandatory period of Ineligibility is a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years.

20. However, Rule 10.4 ADR specifies that the period of Ineligibility for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation may be greater than the standard sanction when it is established that Aggravating Circumstances are present:

> *"10.4 Aggravating Circumstances that may increase the period of Ineligibility*
>
> *If the Integrity Unit or other prosecuting authority establishes in an individual case involving an anti-doping rule violation [...] that Aggravating Circumstances are present which justify the imposition of a period of Ineligibility greater than the standard sanction, then the period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable will be increased by an additional period of Ineligibility of up to two (2) years depending on the seriousness of the violation and the nature of the Aggravating Circumstances, unless the Athlete or other Person can establish that they did not knowingly commit the anti-doping rule violation."*

21. Aggravating Circumstances are defined in the ADR as follows:

> "***Aggravating Circumstances:*** *Circumstances involving, or actions by, an Athlete or other Person which may justify the imposition of a period of Ineligibility greater than the standard sanction. Such circumstances and actions shall include, but are not limited to: the Athlete or other Person Used or Possessed multiple Prohibited Substances or Prohibited Methods, Used or Possessed a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method on multiple occasions or committed multiple other anti-doping rule violations; a normal individual would be likely to enjoy the performance-enhancing effects of the anti-doping rule violation(s) beyond the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility; the Athlete or Person engaged in*

[5] Or Testosterone precursors.

deceptive or obstructive conduct to avoid the detection or adjudication of an anti-doping rule violation; or the Athlete or other Person engaged in Tampering during Results Management. For the avoidance of doubt, the examples of circumstances and conduct described herein are not exclusive and other similar circumstances or conduct may also justify the imposition of a longer period of Ineligibility."

22. The analysis of the Sample revealed the presence of Testosterone and its Metabolites. A sample subsequently collected from the Athlete on 6 August 2024 returned an Adverse Analytical Finding for Furosemide[6]. This constitutes clear evidence of the Athlete's Use of multiple Prohibited Substances which is expressly identified in the definition of Aggravating Circumstances and therefore justifies an increase of the period of Ineligibility unless the Athlete can establish that he did not knowingly commit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations.

23. The Athlete has failed to establish that he did not knowingly commit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations. Therefore, the period of Ineligibility to be imposed is a period of six (6) years.

24. 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."*

25. A Notice of Allegation was issued to the Athlete on 17 July 2025. On 23 August 2025, the Athlete confirmed that he admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the asserted Consequences.[7]

---

[6] See First Violation.

[7] The Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations was issued to the Athlete by the AIU 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 admission and acceptance of Consequences on 23 August 2025, no Notice of Charge was ever issued.

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

26. The Athlete shall therefore receive a one (1) year reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR based on an early admission and acceptance of sanction.

27. 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 and Rule 10.4 ADR and the application of Rule 10.8.1 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:

    27.1. a period of Ineligibility of five (5) years commencing on 11 September 2024[8]; and

    27.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results since 20 July 2024, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

28. The Athlete has accepted the above Consequences for his Anti-Doping Rule Violations and has expressly waived his right to have those Consequences 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, 26 August 2025

[8] In calculating the commencement date of the period of Ineligibility for this violation, the Athlete is given credit for the Provisional Suspension and the period of Ineligibility that he has served for the First Violation to date, namely, from 11 September 2024 to date.