

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION¹

NCAA Member Institutions – Case No. 020529

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. Kennesaw State University (Kennesaw State) men's basketball student-athlete Simeon Cottle (Cottle) is a non-participating party.

On January 14, 2026, the United States Attorney's Office in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania indicted Cottle for wire fraud and bribery charges surrounding the events of Kennesaw State's men's basketball game versus Queens College on March 1, 2024.

On January 15, 2026, the enforcement staff notified Kennesaw State of the possible sports betting integrity violations and requested an interview with Cottle, who was in his final year of eligibility. Kennesaw State advised that Cottle had been suspended from the team. On January 16, 2026, the enforcement staff attempted to contact Cottle's then attorney but did not receive a response.

On January 21, 2026, Kennesaw State informed the enforcement staff Cottle was still enrolled and on financial aid at the institution.

On February 11, 2026, the enforcement staff contacted Cottle's new attorney and requested an interview. On February 18, 2026, the enforcement staff requested Cottle produce copies of communications with criminal actors and other teammates about sports integrity matters as alleged in the indictment. On February 18, 2026, Cottle's attorney advised Cottle would not participate in the staff's investigation.

On March 13, 2026, the enforcement staff provided Cottle's attorney with access to the draft notice of allegations. On March 16, 2026, Cottle's attorney advised the enforcement staff Cottle would not participate in the processing of the case.

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

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

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.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020529

April 28, 2026

Page No. 2

Beginning January 15, 2026, and continuing to the present, Cottle failed to cooperate when he refused to participate in an interview and produce text records relevant to the investigation. Specifically, on January 15 and February 18, 2026, the enforcement staff requested, respectively, an interview with and text records from Cottle regarding potential sports betting integrity issues. On February 23, 2026, Cottle notified the enforcement staff he would not participate in the investigation.

III. OTHER VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION SUBSTANTIATED; NOT ALLEGED

None.

IV. REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES

None.

V. PARTIES TO THE CASE

Cottle declined to participate in the case.

VI. AGREEMENTS²

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 involved nonparticipating party of 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.

² Pursuant to Committee on Infractions IOP 4-7-1-2-2, after appropriate notice from the enforcement staff, a party who knowingly chooses not to participate in the negotiated resolution process, and who does not contest or otherwise respond to the allegations, shall be in default and their non-participation shall be viewed as acceptance of the terms of the agreement. The hearing panel may approve the negotiated resolution in the defaulting party's absence.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020529

April 28, 2026

Page No. 3

- 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 or become 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.

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, chief hearing officer

Steve Waterfield