
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Mr Dickson Kimeli 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. Mr Dickson Kimeli Cheruiyot ("the **Athlete**") is a 39-year-old road runner from Kenya¹.
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 the Anti-Doping Rule Violations:

"2.1 Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample

¹ <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/kenya/dickson-cheruyot-14551110>

[...]

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

5. On 22 March 2026, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition at the 'Marathon Cucuta Metropolitana' held in San Jose de Cucuta, Colombia, pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of World Athletics-AIU which was given code 1614495 (the "Sample").
6. On 20 April 2026, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("WADA") accredited laboratory in Salt Lake City, United States of America (the "Laboratory"), reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Sample based on the presence of Eptrenbolone (a Metabolite of Trenbolone), and on 26 May 2026, the Laboratory also confirmed the presence of recombinant Erythropoietin ("rEPO") in the Sample (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 Eptrenbolone and/or rEPO 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 19 June 2026, the AIU notified the Athlete of the Adverse Analytical Finding (via the e-mail address the Athlete provided on the Doping Control Form he completed on 22 March 2026) 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, and of the imposition of an immediate Provisional Suspension.
9. The Athlete was also informed of his rights, *inter alia*, to request the analysis of the B Sample, to request copies of the laboratory documentation supporting, and to give a written explanation for, the Adverse Analytical Finding, and to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction of the period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR, by no later than 26 June 2026.
10. The Athlete failed to respond to the Notice of Allegation by 26 June 2026.
11. On 29 June 2026, the AIU therefore informed the Athlete via e-mail that he was deemed to have irrevocably waived his right to the analysis of the B Sample in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1(c) of the ISRM. The Athlete was reminded that he may admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction of the period of Ineligibility and that if he failed to do so the AIU would proceed by issuing a Notice of Charge in accordance with Article 7 of the ISRM.
12. The Athlete failed to provide a response to the AIU.

13. The AIU remained satisfied that the Athlete had committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR and, therefore, on 10 July 2026, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Charge in accordance with Rule 8.5.1 ADR and Article 7.1 of the ISRM notifying him that (i) he was being charged with Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR (the “**Charge**”) and that (ii) the Consequences that the AIU would seek included a period of Ineligibility of six (6) years (as further explained below) and disqualification of his results on and since 22 March 2026.
14. The AIU invited the Athlete to confirm how he would like to proceed with the Charge by no later than 24 July 2026.
15. The Athlete was informed *inter alia* that if he failed to respond, he would be deemed to have waived his right to a hearing, admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences set out in the Charge.
16. The Athlete failed to respond to the Notice of Charge by 24 July 2026.
17. Therefore, on 4 August 2026, the AIU wrote to the Athlete noting that he had not responded to the Notice of Charge, had failed to request a hearing (and was deemed to have waived his right to request a hearing), and was deemed to have admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences set out in the Notice of Charge. The Athlete was informed that the AIU would issue a final decision in his case shortly.
18. The Athlete has failed to respond to the AIU at all.

Consequences

19. This is the Athlete’s first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
20. 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...”*

21. Trenbolone, and its Metabolites, is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2026 Prohibited List under Section S1.1 (*Anabolic Androgenic Steroids*). rEPO is also a Prohibited Substance under Section S2 (*Peptide Hormones, Growth Factors, Related Substances and Mimetics*). Both substances are classified as Non-Specified Substances and are prohibited at all times.

22. The period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore a period of four (4) years, unless the Athlete demonstrates that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional.
23. The Athlete has not demonstrated that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional. Therefore, the mandatory period of Ineligibility to be imposed is a period of four (4) years.
24. 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. ”

25. 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.”

26. The Adverse Analytical Finding confirms the presence of Epi trenbolone and rEPO in the Sample that was collected on 22 March 2026.
27. This constitutes clear evidence of the Athlete’s use of “*multiple Prohibited Substances or Prohibited Methods*” which is expressly identified in the definition of Aggravating Circumstances.

28. The above 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.
29. 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.
30. On the basis that the Athlete is deemed to have admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR and accepted the specified Consequences, in accordance with Rule 10.2.1 ADR, Rule 10.9.3(b) ADR and Rule 10.4 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences:
- 30.1. a period of Ineligibility of six (6) years commencing on 19 June 2026 (the date of the Provisional Suspension); and
- 30.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 22 March 2026, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

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, WADA, the Anti-Doping Agency of Kenya ("**ADAK**") and the Athlete 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 ADAK, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise his right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 14 August 2026