

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION¹

NCAA Member Institutions – Case No. 020500

April 28, 2026

I. CASE SYNOPSIS

The NCAA enforcement staff believes a hearing panel of the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions could conclude violations occurred pursuant to NCAA Bylaws 19.7.2 and 19.7.5.3 and Committee on Infractions Internal Operating Procedure (IOP) 4-7-1-2-2. Former Fordham University (Fordham) men's basketball student-athlete Elijah Gray (Gray) agrees with the violation in which he is named as detailed below. Former Fordham men's basketball student-athlete Will Richardson (Richardson) is a non-participating party.

On September 5, 2025, the enforcement staff interviewed a third party in connection with another sports betting investigation. The staff interviewed the third party because of his connections with two known bettors (Known Bettors 1 and 2).² The third party reported Known Bettor 1 made connections with men's basketball student-athletes under the guise of being a name image and likeness agent and subsequently recruited some of these student-athletes to underperform in games for purposes of sports betting. The third party also reported that law enforcement interviewed him and asked about connections with several men's basketball programs and student-athletes, including Fordham men's basketball student-athletes.

The enforcement staff then engaged state gaming regulators to identify bets Known Bettor 2 placed on men's college basketball games. The Mississippi Gaming Commission reported that February 23, 2024, Known Bettor 2 placed a \$10,000 bet on the Duquesne University (Duquesne) versus Fordham men's basketball game scheduled for later that day. Specifically, Known Bettor 2 bet on Duquesne to win the game.

The enforcement staff reviewed the 2023-24 Fordham roster and identified three former men's basketball student-athletes – Gray; Richardson and Student-Athlete 1 – with social media connections to Known Bettors 1 and 2 and another known bettor.

The enforcement staff interviewed Richardson October 17, 2025.³ Richardson reported Gray came to him the day of the Duquesne game and told him someone texted him about being paid money if they lost the game. Richardson denied being a part of any calls with Gray and the known bettors and denied agreeing to be a part of the plan to throw the game. The enforcement staff concluded Richardson's interview by admonishing him about the importance of confidentiality.

¹ In reviewing this agreement, the hearing panel made editorial revisions pursuant to NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions (COI) Internal Operating Procedure (IOP) 4-7-1-2. These modifications did not affect the substance of the agreement.

² Known Bettors 1 and 2 were indicted on January 14, 2026, by the United States Attorney's Office in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania on wire fraud and bribery charges related to sports contests.

³ Richardson transferred to the University at Albany for the 2025-26 season.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020500

April 28, 2026

Page No. 2

The staff specifically instructed Richardson not to talk to former teammates, including Gray, about the subject matter of his interview.

The enforcement staff interviewed Student-Athlete 1 October 20, 2025. Student-Athlete 1 reported overhearing Gray, Richardson and Student-Athlete 2 discussing throwing the Duquesne game. Student-Athlete 1 stated he was in his bedroom of the apartment he shared with Gray and Student-Athlete 2 and overheard a conversation between Gray, Richardson and Student-Athlete 2 about receiving a text regarding being paid to throw that game.

The enforcement staff interviewed Gray October 21, 2025.⁴ Gray reported that a few days before the February 23, 2024, men's basketball game versus Duquesne, Known Bettor 2 reached out to Gray via Instagram, and the two exchanged direct messages, during which Known Bettor 2 provided Gray with his cell phone number. Gray reported he recognized Known Bettor 2 from seeing him at AAU tournaments in his hometown of Charlotte, North Carolina. Subsequently, Known Bettor 2 called Gray via FaceTime during which he solicited Gray to underperform in the upcoming game against Duquesne and requested he recruit teammates to do the same. Gray informed Richardson about the solicitation, and they had a second FaceTime call with Known Bettor 2 and a former NBA player/known bettor. During the second call, Known Bettor 2 instructed Gray and Richardson to lose the game by missing a few extra shots and rebounds, and if they did, they would each receive \$10,000 to \$15,000. Gray and Richardson agreed.

Gray reported that prior to the February 23, 2024, game, he reconsidered and chose not to follow through with underperforming. He reported that he played with his normal effort and production, consistent with the role and playing time assigned to him by the coaching staff during the game. Gray maintained he did not go through with the plan, and Fordham won the game. Gray reported, and the record supports, that he never received any money or other pecuniary gain from Known Bettor 2. After the game, Known Bettor 2 texted Gray expressing disappointment that Fordham won, but Gray did not respond. Gray had no further communication with Known Bettor 2 or the former NBA player/known bettor. Gray further reported that Richardson continued to communicate with the former NBA player/known bettor following the game, and that Richardson showed him screenshots of their direct message exchanges. Gray did not recall the contents of those messages.

Gray also reported that the day before his interview with the enforcement staff, Richardson called and told him he had an interview with the NCAA related to Richardson's FanDuel activities. Gray's FaceTime call log verifies that Richardson had two FaceTime calls with Gray October 21, 2025.

The enforcement staff interviewed Richardson again October 27, 2025. Richardson denied telling Gray about the interview. Richardson further denied Gray's and Student-Athlete 1's reports about the plan to throw the Duquesne game. Specifically, Richardson denied being a part of the

⁴ Gray transferred to the University of Wisconsin-Madison for the 2025-26 season.

FaceTime call with Known Bettor 2 and the former NBA player/known bettor and denied communicating with the NBA player/known bettor following the game. However, the factual record supports Richardson participated in the plan to lose the Duquesne game.

II. FINDINGS OF FACT, VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION AND VIOLATION LEVELS

1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 10.01.1 and 10.3 (2023-24)] (Level I)⁵

On or around February 23, 2024, Gray violated the principles of NCAA honesty and sportsmanship when he knowingly provided information to individuals involved in sports betting activities before a men's basketball game to financially benefit himself and others.⁶ Specifically, shortly before the institution's February 23, 2024, game versus Duquesne, Gray agreed to lose or attempt to lose by more points than the betting spread identified by sports book operators in a conspiracy with outside bettors for pecuniary gain.

2. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 10.01.1 and 10.3 (2023-24)] (Level I)⁷

On or around February 23, 2024, Richardson violated the principles of NCAA honesty and sportsmanship when he knowingly provided information to individuals involved in sports betting activities before a men's basketball game to financially benefit himself and others.⁸ Specifically, shortly before the institution's February 23, 2024, game versus Duquesne, Richardson agreed to lose or attempt to lose by more points than the betting spread identified by sports book operators in a conspiracy with outside bettors for pecuniary gain.

⁵ Because a student-athlete (and not a current or former institutional staff member) committed the violation alleged and is the named involved individual, the institution's portion of this case will be processed as Level III pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.1.1.

⁶ The investigation also determined that Gray placed bets on professional sports, including a multi-leg parlay that contained a single college sports contest along with professional sports contests. These other violations did not involve any integrity issues. Therefore, because a student athlete (and not a current or former institutional staff member) committed the sports betting violations and is the named involved individual, the institution will report the violations to be processed Level III pursuant to Bylaw 19.1.1.

⁷ Because a student-athlete (and not a current or former institutional staff member) committed the violation alleged and is the named involved individual, the institution's portion of this case will be processed as Level III pursuant to Bylaw 19.1.1.

⁸ The investigation also determined that Richardson placed bets on collegiate and professional sports competitions. These other violations did not involve any integrity issues. Therefore, because a student athlete (and not a current or former institutional staff member) committed the sports betting violations and is the named involved individual, the institution will report the violations to be processed Level III pursuant to Bylaw 19.1.1.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020500

April 28, 2026

Page No. 4

3. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 19.2.1, 19.2.1-(c), 19.2.1-(d), 19.2.1-(h), 19.2.2, 19.2.2-(a) and 19.2.2-(c) (2025-26)] (Level I)

Between October 17 and 27, 2025, Richardson failed to cooperate with the investigation when he knowingly provided false or misleading information to the enforcement staff regarding his knowledge of and/or involvement in a violation of NCAA legislation and failed to preserve the integrity of the investigation. Specifically:

- a. On October 17 and 27, 2025, Richardson provided false or misleading information to the enforcement staff when he denied communicating with anyone about and/or being involved in agreeing to lose or attempt to lose by more points than the betting spread identified by sports book operators. However, the factual record substantiates Richardson participated in a FaceTime call with a teammate and outside bettors prior to the institution's February 23, 2024, men's basketball contest to conspire to intentionally underperform during the game. [NCAA Bylaws 19.2.1, 19.2.1-(c), 19.2.1-(d), 19.2.2, 19.2.2-(a) and 19.2.2-(c) (2025-26)]
- b. On or around October 21, 2025, Richardson contacted a former teammate with knowledge of and/or involvement in the violations outlined in Findings of Fact No. 2 who had yet to be interviewed by the enforcement staff and disclosed information related to his October 17, 2025, interview. [NCAA Bylaws 19.2.1, 19.2.1-(h), 19.2.2-(a) and 19.2.2-(c) (2025-26)]

III. OTHER VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION SUBSTANTIATED; NOT ALLEGED

None.

IV. REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES

As noted, Gray maintained he did not engage in game manipulation, and the record reflects he received no related compensation. Additionally, during his NCAA interview, Gray was immediately forthcoming about his involvement, and all documentation he produced was consistent with his statements. Gray accepts full responsibility for his actions and expresses genuine remorse.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020500

April 28, 2026

Page No. 5

V. PARTIES' TO THE CASE

A. Party to negotiated resolution.

Gray.

B. Not participating in the case.

Richardson.

VI. OTHER AGREEMENTS

The enforcement staff believes this case can be processed through the NCAA negotiated resolution process as outlined in Bylaw 19.10 and pursuant to Committee on Infractions IOP 4-7-1-2-2, and a hearing panel comprised of members of the Committee on Infractions will review the negotiated resolution.

The enforcement staff notified the nonparticipating party of, and the participating party agrees with and/or acknowledges the following:

- The negotiated resolution contains findings of fact of NCAA violations based on information available at this time.
- Nothing in this resolution precludes the enforcement staff from investigating additional information about potential rules violations.
- Pursuant to Bylaw 19.1.2, the violations identified in this agreement occurred and should be classified as Level I.
- This negotiated resolution may be voidable by the Committee on Infractions if any of the involved parties were aware of or became aware of information that materially alters the factual information on which this negotiated resolution is based.
- The hearing panel, subsequent to its review of the negotiated resolution, may reject the negotiated resolution.
- Should the hearing panel reject the negotiated resolution, the hearing panel will issue instructions for processing of the case pursuant to hearing resolution (Bylaw 19.8) or limited resolution (Bylaw 19.9) and prior agreed-upon terms of the rejected negotiated resolution will not be binding.
- Should a hearing panel approve the negotiated resolution, there are no NCAA hearing and appellate opportunities.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020500

April 28, 2026

Page No. 6

VII. DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS APPROVAL

Pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.10.1, the panel approves the resolution. The panel's review of this resolution is limited. Panels may only reject a negotiated resolution agreement if the agreement is not in the best interests of the Association or if the agreed-upon penalties are manifestly unreasonable. *See* Bylaw 19.10.4. In this case, the panel determines the uncontested facts and violations are appropriate for this process. Pursuant to Bylaw 19.10.6, this resolution has no precedential value.

NCAA COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS PANEL

Norman Bay

Jody Conradt

Steve Waterfield, chief hearing officer