

---

# Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Mercyline Chelangat

---

## 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 Mercyline Chelangat ("the **Athlete**") is a 28-year-old road runner from Uganda.<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/uganda/mercyline-chelangat-14693567>

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

5. On 13 August 2025, the Athlete provided a urine Sample Out-of-Competition in Kapchorwa, Uganda, which was given code 18390490 (the “**First Sample**”) pursuant to Testing conducted under the authority of the Uganda Olympic Committee (“**UGA-NADO**”)<sup>2</sup>.
6. On 14 September 2025, the Athlete provided another urine Sample In-Competition at the 2025 World Athletics Championships held in Tokyo, Japan (the “**Tokyo World Championships**”), which was given code 1412493 (the “**Second Sample**”) pursuant to Testing conducted under the authority of World Athletics - AIU.
7. On 19 September 2025, the World Anti-Doping Agency (“**WADA**”)-accredited laboratory in Stockholm, Sweden (the “**Stockholm Laboratory**”) reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the First Sample based on the presence of Testosterone<sup>3</sup> metabolites, Androsterone, Etiocholanolone and 5 $\alpha$ -androstane-3 $\alpha$ ,17 diol (“**5 $\alpha$ Adiol**”) consistent with exogenous origin<sup>4</sup> (the “**First Adverse Analytical Finding**”).
8. On 10 October 2025, the WADA-accredited laboratory in Tokyo, Japan (the “**Tokyo Laboratory**”) reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Second Sample based on the presence of Testosterone and its metabolites, Androsterone and 5 $\alpha$ Adiol consistent with exogenous origin<sup>5</sup> (the “**Second Adverse Analytical Finding**”).
9. The AIU reviewed the Second 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 Testosterone (or its metabolites) found in the Second Sample; and
  - 9.2. 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 Second Adverse Analytical Finding.
10. On 10 October 2025, the AIU notified the Athlete of the Second Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 of the ISRM including that the Second Adverse Analytical Finding may result in an Anti-Doping Rule Violation pursuant to Rule 2.1 ADR and/or Rule 2.2 ADR, and of the imposition of an immediate Provisional Suspension. The Athlete was also informed of her rights, *inter alia*, to request the analysis of the B Sample of the Second

---

<sup>2</sup> The Uganda Olympic Committee fulfills the responsibility of the National Anti-Doping Organization in Uganda and has delegated areas of its national anti-doping programs, including results management, to the Africa Zone V Regional Anti-Doping Agency (the “**RADO**”).

<sup>3</sup> or Testosterone precursors.

<sup>4</sup> following analysis by GC/C/IRMS (cf. WADA Technical Document [TD2022IRMS](#) on the Detection of Synthetic Forms of Prohibited Substances by GC/C/IRMS).

<sup>5</sup> following analysis by GC/C/IRMS.

Sample, to request copies of the laboratory documentation supporting the Second Adverse Analytical Finding and to provide an explanation for the Second Adverse Analytical Finding by no later than 20 October 2025.

11. On 17 October 2025, upon request of the AIU, the Athlete attended an interview with AIU representatives (the “**Interview**”), during which she stated *inter alia* that:
  - 11.1. she was injured in 2023 and, as a result, had been using Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and other pain killers on a daily basis for almost two (2) years prior to the Tokyo World Championships;
  - 11.2. she was treated for pneumonia in August 2025 in a clinic in Uganda and received several unspecified injections; and
  - 11.3. she accepted the Second Adverse Analytical Finding but claimed that she had not intentionally Used any Prohibited Substances.
12. The Athlete also confirmed that she would provide the AIU with all relevant medical documents supporting the above.
13. On 18 October 2025, the Athlete provided the AIU with a written explanation, in which she confirmed her explanation given during the Interview (as summarised above), and submitted the following documents:
  - 13.1.1. A two (2)-page document entitled “Clinical Notes” referring to a diagnosis of pneumonia and the prescription of several medications;
  - 13.1.2. A two (2)-page list of 10 supplements and medications;
  - 13.1.3. Photos of partially used supplements; and
  - 13.1.4. A screenshot of the packaging of Ziclom-50 (Clomiphene citrate tablet I.P. 50mg)<sup>6</sup>.
14. The AIU noted that none of the medications or supplements referred to in the documents submitted by the Athlete was, or contained, Testosterone or a Testosterone precursor.
15. On 22 October 2025, the AIU asked the Athlete to provide clearer copies of the documents she had submitted<sup>7</sup>, to provide further details in relation to her apparent use of Clomiphene and to further explain the list of medications/supplement she submitted on 18 October 2025.
16. On 23 October 2025, the Athlete sent clearer copies of the two (2)-page document entitled “Clinical Notes” referring to a diagnosis of pneumonia and of the two (2)-page list of 10

---

<sup>6</sup> Clomiphene (or Clomifene) is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2025 Prohibited List. The AIU noted that the Athlete did not have a TUE that had been granted for her Use of Clomiphene.

<sup>7</sup> The Clinic’s name, date of the visit and name of the patient were not visible at the top of the “Clinical Notes” document.

supplements and medications to the AIU<sup>8</sup>. The Athlete also submitted additional documents indicating that she had been seen by a doctor in August 2025 who recommended that she take Clomiphene.

17. The AIU again confirmed that none of the medications or supplements referred to in the documents submitted by the Athlete was or contained Testosterone or a Testosterone precursor.
18. On 17 December 2025, in accordance with Rule 7.1.3, the RADO, on behalf of UGA-NADO, delegated its authority for Results Management in relation to the First Adverse Analytical Finding to the AIU, so that it could be treated together with the Second Adverse Analytical Finding.
19. The AIU therefore reviewed the First Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5 of the ISRM and determined that:
  - 19.1. the Athlete did not have a TUE that had been granted (or that would be granted) for the Testosterone metabolites found in the Sample; and
  - 19.2. there was no apparent departure from the ISTI or from the ISL that could reasonably have caused the First Adverse Analytical Finding.
20. Therefore, on 19 December 2025, the AIU notified the Athlete of the First Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 of the ISRM, including that the First Adverse Analytical Finding may result in Anti-Doping Rule Violations pursuant to Rule 2.1 ADR and/or Rule 2.2 ADR<sup>9</sup>. The Athlete was also informed of her rights, *inter alia*, to request the B Sample analysis of the First Sample<sup>10</sup>, to request copies of the laboratory documentation supporting the First Adverse Analytical Finding and to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations (including in relation to her apparent Use of Clomiphene in August 2025) and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR by 5 January 2026.
21. On 31 December 2025, the Athlete returned an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed to confirm that she admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences specified in the Notice of Allegation issued on 19 December 2025.

---

<sup>8</sup> The Athlete confirmed that she did not inform the doctor that she was an elite athlete.

<sup>9</sup> The AIU informed the Athlete that, in accordance with Rule 10.9.3 (a), the First and Second Adverse Analytical Finding would be considered together as one single first violation, and the sanction imposed will be based on the violation that carries the more severe sanction, including the application of Aggravating Circumstances.

<sup>10</sup> The AIU noted that the Athlete had not requested the B Sample analysis of the Second Sample by the 20 October 2025 deadline specified in the Notice of Allegation dated 10 October 2025. She was therefore deemed to have irrevocably waived her right to the B Sample analysis for the Second Sample in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1(c) ISRM.

## Consequences

22. This is the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
23. 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."*

24. Clomiphene (or Clomifene) is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2025 Prohibited List under the category S4.2 Anti-estrogenic substances. It is a Specified Substance prohibited at all times.
25. Testosterone (and its metabolites) is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2025 Prohibited List under the category S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids. It is a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times.
26. 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.
27. 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.
28. 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."*

29. 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 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.”*

30. The analysis of the First and Second Samples revealed the presence of Testosterone and/or its Metabolites in Samples collected on 13 August 2025 and 14 September 2025. The Athlete has also admitted to the Use of Clomiphene in August 2025.

31. This constitutes clear evidence of the Athlete’s use of “*a Prohibited Substance on multiple occasions*” and of her use of “*multiple Prohibited Substances*”, which are both expressly identified in the definition of Aggravating Circumstances.

32. The above therefore justifies an increase of the period of Ineligibility unless the Athlete can establish that she did not knowingly commit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations.

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

34. 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.”*

35. A Notice of Allegation was issued to the Athlete on 19 December 2025. On 31 December 2025, the Athlete confirmed that she admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the asserted period of Ineligibility of six (6) years.<sup>11</sup>
36. 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.
37. 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:
- 37.1. a period of Ineligibility of five (5) years commencing on 10 October 2025 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and
- 37.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results since 13 August 2025, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any medals, titles, awards, points, prizes, prize money and appearance money.

## Publication

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

## Rights of Appeal

39. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
40. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, WADA and the UGA-NADO 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.
41. If an appeal is filed against this decision by WADA or the UGA-NADO, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise his right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 5 January 2026

---

<sup>11</sup> 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 31 December 2025, no Notice of Charge was ever issued.