
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Mr. Carey McLeod

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. Carey McLeod ("the **Athlete**") is a 28-year-old long jumper from Jamaica¹.
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)."*

Whereabouts Failures

4. Rule 2.4 ADR sets out that the following shall constitute an Anti-Doping Rule Violation:

"2.4 Whereabouts Failures by an Athlete in a Registered Testing Pool

Any combination of three missed tests and/or filing failures, as defined in the International Standard for Results Management, within a 12-month period by an Athlete in a Registered Testing Pool."

¹ <https://worldathletics.org/athletes/jamaica/carey-mcleod-14693824>

5. A Missed Test and a Filing Failure are defined in the International Standard for Results Management (“**ISRM**”) respectively as follows:

*“**Missed Test**: A failure by the Athlete to be available for Testing at the location and time specified in the 60-minute time slot identified in their Whereabouts Filing for the day in question, in accordance with Article 4.8 of the International Standard for Testing and Investigations and Annex B.2 of the International Standard for Results Management.*”

*“**Filing Failure**: A failure by the Athlete (or by a third party to whom the Athlete has delegated the task) to make an accurate and complete Whereabouts Filing that enables the Athlete to be located for Testing at the times and locations set out in the Whereabouts Filing or to update that Whereabouts Filing where necessary to ensure that it remains accurate and complete, all in accordance with Article 4.8 of the International Standard for Testing and Investigations and Annex B.2 of the International Standard for Results Management.”*

6. In short, an Athlete violates Rule 2.4 of the ADR where he or she has any combination of three Missed Tests and/or Filing Failures within any twelve-month period, that period beginning on the date of the first relevant Missed Test/Filing Failure.

The Athlete’s Commission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation

7. In this instance, the Athlete committed three (3) Whereabouts Failures within a twelve-month period beginning on 30 June 2025, specifically:

- (i) a Missed Test and a Filing Failure on 30 June 2025;
- (ii) a Filing Failure on 9 August 2025; and
- (iii) a Missed Test and a Filing Failure on 1 May 2026.

8. The circumstances of each of these Whereabouts Failures are set out in summary below.

I. **First Whereabouts Failure – Missed Test and Filing Failure on 30 June 2025**

9. The Athlete’s Whereabouts information stated that he would be at an address in St Andrew, Jamaica (“the **St Andrew Address**”) on 30 June 2025 during his 60-minute time slot between 05:00-06:00.
10. A Doping Control Officer (“**DCO**”) was unable to locate the Athlete for Testing at the St Andrew Address on 30 June 2025 between 05:00-06:00 as specified in his Whereabouts information.
11. Therefore, on 1 July 2025, the AIU wrote to the Athlete requesting his explanation for an apparent Whereabouts Failure which occurred on 30 June 2025 by no later than 15 July 2025.
12. The Athlete failed to respond or to provide any explanation by the 15 July 2025 deadline (or at all).

13. Therefore, on 22 July 2025, the AIU confirmed the Whereabouts Failure on 30 June 2025 against the Athlete. He was afforded the right to request an administrative review of that decision by no later than 5 August 2025 and advised that, if he failed to do so, the Whereabouts Failure would be considered as a Whereabouts Failure for the purposes of Rule 2.4 ADR.
14. No request for an administrative review was filed by 5 August 2025 (or at all).
15. Accordingly, the AIU recorded a first Whereabouts Failure against the Athlete effective 30 June 2025².

II. Second Whereabouts Failure –Filing Failure on 9 August 2025

16. On 9 August 2025 at 15:28 GMT, the Athlete updated his 60-minute time slot and overnight accommodation for the next two days (10 August 2025 and 11 August 2025), from an address in Arkansas, USA, to an address in Budapest, Hungary.
17. This meant that for 9 August 2025, the Athlete's overnight accommodation address (i.e., his address for the period beginning at 23:00 on 9 August 2025 and ending at 05:00 on 10 August 2025) was in Arkansas, USA, but his 60-minute time slot for the next day (beginning at 05:00) was in Budapest, Hungary. Furthermore, the Athlete's overnight accommodation for 11 August 2025 was at an address in Budapest, Hungary, but his 60-minute time slot for the next day (beginning at 05:00) was in Arkansas, USA.
18. In addition, on 12 August 2025, the Athlete competed at the World Athletics Continental Tour - Gyulai Istvan Hungarian Athletics Grand Prix in Budapest, Hungary. However, the Athlete failed to update his Whereabouts information, which specified that he was in Arkansas, USA on 12 August 2025.
19. Pursuant to the foregoing, the AIU considered that the Athlete had failed to update his Whereabouts information as soon as possible after a change in circumstances in accordance with Article 4.8.8.6 of the WADA International Standard for Testing and Investigations ("ISTI") and that, in any event, the Athlete's Whereabouts information was inaccurate.
20. Therefore, on 13 August 2025, the AIU requested the Athlete's explanation for an apparent Whereabouts Failure which occurred on 9 August 2025 by no later than 27 August 2025.
21. The Athlete failed to respond or to provide any explanation by the 27 August 2025 deadline (or at all).
22. Therefore, on 29 August 2025, the AIU confirmed the Whereabouts Failure on 9 August 2025 against the Athlete. He was afforded the right to request an administrative review of that decision by no later than 12 September 2025 and advised that, if he failed to do so, the

² This Whereabouts Failure was confirmed as a Missed Test and a Filing Failure.

Whereabouts Failure would be considered as a Whereabouts Failure for the purposes of Rule 2.4 ADR.

23. No request for an administrative review was filed by 12 September 2025 (or at all).
24. Therefore, the AIU recorded a Whereabout Failure³ against the Athlete effective 9 August 2025 as his second Whereabouts Failure in the twelve-month period beginning on 30 June 2025.

III. Third Whereabouts Failure – Missed Test and Filing Failure on 1 May 2026

25. The Athlete's Whereabouts information stated that he would be at an address in Clarendon, Jamaica ("the Clarendon Address) during his 60-minute time slot between 06:35-07:35.
26. A DCO was unable to locate the Athlete for Testing on 1 May 2026 between 06:35-07:35 at the Clarendon Address specified in his Whereabouts information.
27. Therefore, on 5 May 2026, the AIU requested the Athlete's explanation for an apparent Whereabouts Failure which occurred on 1 May 2026 by no later than 19 May 2026.
28. The Athlete failed to provide any explanation by the 19 May 2026 deadline.
29. Therefore, on 26 May 2026, the AIU confirmed the Whereabouts Failure on 1 May 2026 against the Athlete. He was afforded the right to request an administrative review of that decision by no later than 9 June 2026 and advised that, if he failed to do so, the Whereabouts Failure would be considered as a Whereabouts Failure for the purposes of Rule 2.4 ADR.
30. On the same day, 26 May 2026, the Athlete's appointed attorney confirmed by e-mail to the AIU that the Athlete did not dispute the decision to confirm the Whereabouts Failure on 1 May 2026 against him and asked that the Whereabouts Failure be recorded so that the "*case can move forward urgently*".
31. Therefore, the AIU recorded a Whereabout Failure⁴ against the Athlete effective 1 May 2026 as his third Whereabouts Failure in the twelve-month period beginning on 30 June 2025.

Disciplinary proceedings

32. On 28 May 2026, in accordance with Article B.3.4 and Article 5.3.2 ISRM, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Allegation of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation pursuant to Rule 2.4 ADR and imposed a Provisional Suspension with immediate effect.
33. On the same day, 28 May 2026, the Athlete returned a signed Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violation and Acceptance of Consequences Form confirming that he admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violation and accepted the Consequences specified in the Notice of Allegation.

³ This Whereabouts Failure was confirmed as both a Missed Test and a Filing Failure.

⁴ This Whereabouts Failure was confirmed as a Missed Test and as a Filing Failure.

Consequences

34. This is the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
35. Rule 10.3.2 ADR specifies that the period of Ineligibility for an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.4 ADR shall be as follows:
- “10.3.2 For violations of Rule 2.4, the period of Ineligibility will be two (2) years, subject to reduction down to a minimum of one (1) year, depending on the Athlete's degree or Fault. The flexibility between two (2) years and one (1) year of Ineligibility in this Rule is not available to Athletes where a pattern of last-minute whereabouts changes or other conduct raises a serious suspicion that the Athlete was trying to avoid being available for Testing.”*
36. On the basis that the Athlete has admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Rule 2.4 ADR and accepted the Consequences specified by the AIU, in accordance with Rule 10.3.2 ADR and the application of Rule 8.5.6 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:
- 36.1. a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years commencing on 28 May 2026 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and
- 36.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 1 May 2026, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any medals, titles, awards, points, prizes, prize money and appearance money.
37. The Athlete has accepted the above Consequences for his Anti-Doping Rule Violation and has expressly waived his right to have those Consequences determined by the Disciplinary Tribunal at a hearing.

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, the Athlete, WADA and the Jamaica Anti-Doping Commission (“**JADCO**”) 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 JADCO, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise his right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 29 May 2026