Athletics Integrity Unit

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

Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Lydia Cheptarus Cheruiyot

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 Lydia Cheptarus Cheruiyot ("the **Athlete**") is a 25-year-old long-distance 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/lydia-cheptarus-cheruiyot-14810065

[…]

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

5. On 28 September 2025, the Athlete provided a urine Sample, In-Competition at the Wecasablanca International Challenge held in Morocco, pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of World Athletics-AIU, which was given code 1634739 (the "**Sample**").

6. On 27 October 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 Triamcinolone acetonide (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 for the Triamcinolone acetonide found in the Sample;

   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; and

   7.3. it was not apparent that the Adverse Analytical Finding was caused by an ingestion of the relevant Prohibited Substance through a permitted route.

8. Therefore, on 29 October 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 31 October 2025, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete.

Consequences

10. This is the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.

11. 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.

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."

12. Triamcinolone acetonide is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2025 Prohibited List under the category S9. Glucocorticoids. It is a Specified Substance prohibited In-Competition when administered by any injectable, oral (including oromucosal) or rectal route.

13. 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.

14. 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.

15. 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:

    15.1. a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years commencing on 31 October 2025; and

    15.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 28 September 2025, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

16. 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

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

Rights of Appeal

18. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.

19. 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.

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

20. 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, 17 November 2025