
Decision of the Athletics Integrity Unit in the Case of Ms Anjelina Nadai Lohalith

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 Anjelina Nadai Lohalith (“the **Athlete**”) is a 29-year-old middle-distance and distance runner originally from South Sudan and a member of the World Athletics Athlete Refugee Team (“**ART**”).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/athlete-refugee-team/anjelina-nadai-lohalith-14818089>

[...]

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

5. On 30 March 2024, in her capacity as a member of the ART, the Athlete provided a urine Sample In-Competition at the '45th World Athletics Cross Country Championships' in Belgrade, Serbia, which was given code 7171229 (the "**Sample**").
6. On 17 April 2024, the World Anti-Doping Agency ("**WADA**") accredited laboratory in Seibersdorf, Austria (the "**Laboratory**") reported an Adverse Analytical Finding in the Sample for the presence of Trimetazidine (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 (or that would be granted) for the Trimetazidine 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. On 30 April 2024, 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 and of the imposition of an immediate Provisional Suspension.
9. 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 and potentially benefit from a one-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR. The AIU also requested that the Athlete provide an explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding by no later than 7 May 2024.
10. On 6 May 2024, the Athlete provided her explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding, which set out, in summary, that:
 - 10.1.1. she had never used or attempted to use performance enhancing substances;
 - 10.1.2. she had tested negative six times before the test on 30 March 2024; and
 - 10.1.3. she had two (speculative) explanations for the Adverse Analytical Finding, namely that:
 - 10.1.3.1. the Adverse Analytical Finding could have been caused by sabotage; and
 - 10.1.3.2. she had been unwell multiple times in the six-month period before 30 March 2024 and was prescribed several medications. The Athlete submitted medical documents from medical facilities in Kenya dating from October

2023, November 2023 and March 2024 in support of this assertion as further explained below.

11. The Athlete enclosed three medical documents with her explanation, (i) a prescription from Medix Diagnostic Laboratory dated 6 November 2023, (ii) an undated and unattributed handwritten “Lab Results” document showing prescription of several tests and test results and (iii) an invoice from Annex Medicare dated 10 March 2024 listing several medications prescribed and test results. However, following review, the AIU noted that none of these documents contained any reference to trimetazidine.
12. On 9 May 2024, the AIU asked the Athlete to attend an interview by video conference on either 21 or 22 May 2024 in relation to her explanations for the Adverse Analytical Finding.
13. On 21 May 2024, the Athlete attended an interview with AIU representatives by video conference and provided further details for her explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding and the alleged Anti-Doping Rule Violations.
14. In summary, the Athlete stated in interview as follows:
 - 14.1. she confirmed the two (speculative) explanations that she had presented in her response to the Notice of Allegation on 6 May 2024, namely that:
 - 14.1.1. she had been in an argument with a third party at the World Athletics Cross Country Championships in Belgrade, Serbia, and that they could have sabotaged the Athlete’s water bottle, which could explain the Adverse Analytical Finding; and
 - 14.1.2. she had visited two medical facilities, i.e., the Medix Pharmacy and the Annex Medicare Clinic, for treatment between October 2023 and March 2024 and was prescribed several medications.
 - 14.2. after receiving the Notice of Allegation, she had checked all of the medications that had been prescribed to her and confirmed that none of them contained trimetazidine; and
 - 14.3. she had revisited the Medix Pharmacy and the Annex Medicare Clinic and asked if she had been given anything other than the medications specified on the documents she had, but was told that nothing else had been given to her.
15. Following the Athlete’s attendance at interview on 21 May 2024, the AIU (with the assistance of the Anti-Doping Agency of Kenya (“ADAK”)) conducted additional investigations into the Athlete’s explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding and the medical documents submitted.
16. In the context of that investigation, the AIU obtained additional documents and records from the Medix Pharmacy and the Annex Medicare Clinic, including outpatient records and laboratory analysis logs.
17. According to the laboratory records from the Medix Pharmacy, the Athlete attended the laboratory several times for diagnostic tests, on 10 October 2023, 11 October 2023, 5 November 2023, 22 November 2023 and 26 December 2023. However, there is no indication

that the Athlete received any outpatient treatment at the Medix Pharmacy according to the outpatient records for between 9 October 2023 and 31 January 2024.

18. Laboratory records from the Annex Medicare Laboratory confirm that the Athlete was also seen in that laboratory for tests on 10 March 2024 and 25 March 2024.
19. Outpatient records for the Annex Medicare Clinic confirm that the Athlete was treated at that facility as an outpatient on 10 March 2024. The medications listed in the outpatient log for the Athlete for 10 March 2024 are consistent with the Annex Medicare invoice dated 10 March 2024 that the Athlete submitted with her explanation on 6 May 2024.
20. However, none of the additional documents obtained from the Medix Pharmacy or the Annex Medicare Clinic (including the outpatient records and the laboratory records described above) provided any evidence of treatment with trimetazidine.
21. Following a review of the Athlete's explanation for the Adverse Analytical Finding (including the information obtained by the AIU in the context of its investigation), the AIU remained satisfied that the Athlete had committed Anti-Doping Rule Violations as set out in the Rules.
22. Therefore, on 21 November 2024, the AIU issued the Athlete with a Notice of Charge in accordance with Rule 8.5.1 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 that the Consequences included (i) a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years and (ii) disqualification of her results on and since 30 March 2024. The AIU also invited the Athlete to respond to the Charge confirming how she wished to proceed by no later than 5 December 2024.
23. On 5 December 2024, the Athlete returned an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed to confirm that she admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the Consequences specified in the Notice of Charge.

Consequences

24. This is the Athlete's first Anti-Doping Rule Violation.
25. 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."*

26. Trimetazidine is a Prohibited Substance under the WADA 2024 Prohibited List under the category S4 Hormone and Metabolic Modulators. It is a Non-Specified Substance prohibited at all times.
27. The period of Ineligibility to be imposed is therefore a period of Ineligibility of four (4) years, unless the Athlete demonstrates that the Anti-Doping Rule Violations were not intentional.
28. 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.
29. However, Rule 10.8.1 ADR provides that an athlete potentially subject to an asserted period of Ineligibility of four (4) years or more may benefit from a one (1)-year reduction in the period of Ineligibility based on an early admission and acceptance of sanction:

“10.8.1 One year reduction for certain anti-doping rule violations based on early admission and acceptance of sanction.

Where the Integrity Unit notifies an Athlete or other Person of an anti-doping rule violation charge that carries an asserted period of Ineligibility of four (4) or more years (including any period of Ineligibility asserted under Rule 10.4), if the Athlete or other Person admits the violation and accepts the asserted period of Ineligibility no later than 20 days after receiving the Notice of Charge, the Athlete or other Person may receive a one (1) year reduction in the period of Ineligibility asserted by the Integrity Unit. Where the Athlete or other Person receives the one (1) year reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility under this Rule 10.8.1, no further reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility will be allowed under any other Rule.”

30. A Notice of Charge was issued to the Athlete on 21 November 2024. On 5 December 2024, the AIU received an Admission of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and Acceptance of Consequences Form signed by the Athlete confirming that she admitted the Anti-Doping Rule Violations and accepted the asserted period of Ineligibility of four (4) years.
31. The Athlete shall therefore receive a one (1) year reduction in the asserted period of Ineligibility pursuant to Rule 10.8.1 ADR based on an early admission and acceptance of sanction.
32. 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 and the application of Rule 10.8.1 ADR, the AIU confirms by this decision the following Consequences for a first Anti-Doping Rule Violation:
 - 32.1. a period of Ineligibility of three (3) years commencing on 30 April 2024 (the date of Provisional Suspension); and
 - 32.2. disqualification of the Athlete’s results on and since 30 March 2024, with all resulting Consequences, including the forfeiture of any medals, titles, awards, points, prizes, prize money and appearance money.

33. 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

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

Rights of Appeal

35. This decision constitutes the final decision of the AIU pursuant to Rule 8.5.6 ADR.
36. The rights of appeal against this decision are set out in Rule 13.2.3 ADR, which shall be to the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne, Switzerland, and made in accordance with the procedure set out at Rule 13.6.1 ADR.
37. If an appeal is filed against this decision, the Athlete will be entitled to exercise her right of cross-appeal in accordance with Rule 13.2.4 ADR.

Monaco, 20 December 2024