
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Mr Philemon Kiplimo Kimaiyo

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 Philemon Kiplimo Kimaiyo ("the **Athlete**") is a 27-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/philemon-kiplimo-14862286>

[...]

2.2 Use or Attempted Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method²

5. On 19 July 2026, the Athlete provided a urine Sample, Out-of-Competition in Mwaita, Kenya, pursuant to Testing conducted under the Testing Authority of World Athletics-AIU, which was given code 1778398 (the "**Sample**"). The Sample had a Specific Gravity ("**SG**") of 1.002, below the Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis specified in the WADA International Standard for Testing and Investigations ("**ISTI**") of 1.003.
6. Therefore, in accordance with Annex F of the ISTI, the Athlete was requested to provide further Samples and, following the collection of three (3) further Samples which also returned an SG below 1.003, the Athlete provided a subsequent (fifth) Sample with a Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis, which was given code 1780921.
7. On 29 July 2026, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited laboratory in Paris, France (the "**Laboratory**") reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Sample based on the presence of Chlortalidone (the "**Adverse Analytical Finding**")².
8. Chlortalidone is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2026 Prohibited List under the category *S5. Diuretics and Masking Agent*. It is a Specified Substance prohibited at all times.
9. The AIU reviewed the 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 for the Chlortalidone found in the 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 Adverse Analytical Finding.
10. Therefore, on 25 August 2026, the Athlete attended an interview with AIU representatives, during which he was notified of the Adverse Analytical Finding in accordance with Article 5.1.2.1 ISRM, including that it may result in Anti-Doping Rule Violations pursuant to Rule 2.1 and/or Rule 2.2 ADR (the "**Interview**").
11. During the Interview, AIU representatives provided the Athlete with a copy of a Notice of Allegation of Anti-Doping Rules Violations issued in accordance with Article 5.1.2 of the ISRM by e-mail. The Athlete was informed of his rights, including, *inter alia*, to request analysis of

² In accordance with Article 5.3.3 of the WADA International Standard for Laboratories ("**ISL**"), the Laboratory analysed the Sample and the subsequent Sample collected with the highest Suitable Specific Gravity for Analysis, i.e., Sample 1780921. The Laboratory's analysis of Sample 1780921 did not reveal the presence of any Prohibited Substances.

the B Sample, to request copies of the laboratory documentation supporting the Adverse Analytical Finding, and to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violations.

12. During the Interview, the Athlete provided explanations regarding the Adverse Analytical Finding. In summary, the Athlete stated that he did not know what Chlortalidone was, and explained that, approximately a week before the test, he had taken painkillers that belonged to his wife to treat pain that he experienced after long runs, but whose name and appearance he could not recall. He confirmed that he took no other medications that week, save for vitamins and dietary supplements which he was unable to identify, and undertook to provide photographs of the relevant packaging³.
13. On 1 September 2026, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance Consequences Form signed by the Athlete confirming that he admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences specified in the Notice of Allegation provided to him during the Interview on 25 August 2026.

Consequences

14. This is the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
15. 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."

16. Chlortalidone is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2026 Prohibited List under the category *S5. Diuretics and Masking Agent*. It is a Specified Substance prohibited at all times.
17. 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.

³ On 2 September 2026, the Athlete provided photographs including a photograph of a box for a product named "OLMECURE-CT 40" with the mention "Olmesartan Medoxomil with Chlortalidone Tablets".

18. 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.
19. 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:
- 19.1. a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years starting on 1 September 2026⁴; and
- 19.2. disqualification of the Athlete's results since 19 July 2026, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any titles, awards, medals, points, prizes and appearance money.
20. The Athlete has accepted the above Consequences for his Anti-Doping Rule Violations and has expressly waived his right to have those Consequences determined by the Disciplinary Tribunal at a hearing.

Publication

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

Rights of Appeal

22. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
23. 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.
24. 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, 17 September 2026

⁴ The date on which the Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) and Acceptance of Consequences Form was signed by the Athlete and received by the AIU.