
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Caren Chelagat

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 Caren Chelagat ("the **Athlete**") is a 31-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 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/caren-chelagat-15038555>

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

5. On 3 May 2026, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition at the Durban International Marathon in Durban, South Africa, which was given code 8434178 (the “**First Sample**”) pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of World Athletics.
6. On 7 July 2026, the WADA-accredited laboratory in Doha, Qatar (the “**Laboratory**”) reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Sample based on the presence of exogenous 19-Norandrosterone (“**Norandrosterone**”)² (the “**First 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 (or that would be granted) for the Norandrosterone 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, in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 of the ISRM, on 17 July 2026, the Athlete was notified of the Adverse Analytical Finding³ by representatives of the Anti-Doping Agency of Kenya (“**ADAK**”), acting on behalf of the AIU, in person in Kenya and attended an interview during which she declared the following:
 - 8.1. she never knowingly used any Prohibited Substances or Prohibited Methods;
 - 8.2. the only possible explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding was treatment she had received at a medical facility a few days prior to the Durban International Marathon; and
 - 8.3. she would check her medical records relating to that treatment and provide them to ADAK.
9. On 24 July 2026, the Athlete met once again with the ADAK representative and informed them that she was unable to obtain or produce any medical records to substantiate her earlier assertion that she had received the alleged medical treatment. Nonetheless the Athlete maintained that she had never knowingly used the Prohibited Substance and that she was therefore unable to admit the asserted Anti-Doping Rule Violations or accept the proposed Consequences.

² Norandrosterone is a Metabolite of nandrolone (19-nortestosterone) or nandrolone precursors.

³ The Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rule Violations of 17 July 2026 also imposed a Provisional Suspension (effective immediately), informed the Athlete of her right to the B Sample analysis and invited her to provide a detailed written explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding by no later than 24 July 2026. AIU representatives also provided the Athlete with a copy of the Notice of Allegation together with its enclosures by e-mail on 21 July 2026.

10. On 27 July 2026, the AIU wrote to the Athlete noting her position expressed in the interviews on 17 July 2026 and 24 July 2026 and gave her until no later than 31 July 2026 to provide any additional explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding and supporting documents that she wished to rely upon⁴.
11. The Athlete failed to respond within the given deadline.
12. On 3 August 2026, the AIU extended the Athlete's deadline until 6 August 2026.
13. On 5 August 2026, the Athlete wrote to the AIU via WhatsApp, stating that (i) she did not use any drugs, (ii) she could not afford the cost of such drugs and (iii) she did not know how the Adverse Analytical Finding had occurred.
14. Following a review of the Athlete's explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding, the AIU remained satisfied that she had committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations. Therefore, on 11 August 2026, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Charge in accordance with Rule 8.5.1 ADR and Article 7.1 ISRM confirming that she was being charged with Anti-Doping Rule Violations under Rule 2.1 ADR and Rule 2.2 ADR ("the **Charge**") and invited her to confirm how she would like to proceed with the Charge by 25 August 2026.
15. The Athlete failed to respond to the Charge by the given deadline.
16. Therefore, on 28 August 2026, the AIU wrote to the Athlete noting that:
 - 16.1. she had failed to respond to the Charge within the given deadline and, by operation of Rule 8.5.2(f) ADR, was therefore deemed to have (i) waived her right to a hearing, (ii) admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and (iii) accepted the Consequences set out in the Charge; and
 - 16.2. she had until no later than 31 August 2026 to return a completed Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form (enclosed with the Charge) to benefit from a one (1)-year reduction to the period of Ineligibility under Rule 10.8.1 ADR, and that, if she failed to do so, then the AIU would proceed by issuing a final decision in her case, including imposing a four (4)-year period of Ineligibility.
17. On 29 August 2026, the Athlete wrote to the AIU via WhatsApp further stating that she had not used any drug, was innocent and could not therefore sign the Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form.
18. No Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form was received by the deadline of 31 August 2026 and no benefit can therefore be afforded to the Athlete under Rule 10.8.1 ADR.

⁴ The AIU also noted that the Athlete did not request the B Sample analysis within the given deadline (i.e., by 24 July 2026) and that she was therefore deemed to have waived her right to the B Sample analysis and accepted the finding in the A Sample.

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 or Rule 2.2 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. Norandrosterone (resulting from an exogenous administration) is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2026 Prohibited List under the category S1.1 Anabolic Androgenic Steroids. It is a Non-Specified Substance 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 is a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years.
24. 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 Consequences specified by the AIU, in accordance with Rule 10.2.1 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:
 - 24.1. a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years commencing on 17 July 2026 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and
 - 24.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results on and since 3 May 2026, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

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

27. Further to Rule 13.2.3 ADR, , the Athlete, 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.
28. 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, 4 September 2026