

# NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION<sup>1</sup>

NCAA Member Institutions – Case No. 020431

December 10, 2025

## **I. CASE SYNOPSIS**

Former University of San Francisco (San Francisco) men's basketball student-athlete Marcus Williams (Williams) and the NCAA enforcement staff agree with the violations.

On January 31, 2025, the enforcement staff imaged the cellular phone of then California State University, Fresno (Fresno State) men's basketball student-athlete Mykell Robinson (Robinson) related to another sports betting investigation. Communications on Robinson's phone revealed that on at least nine occasions, Williams knowingly provided information to Robinson, who was wagering on Williams through daily fantasy sports accounts.

Williams, who does not have any eligibility remaining, participated in an interview with the enforcement staff on March 4, 2025. During the interview, Williams provided false or misleading information when he denied having a daily fantasy sports account and associated activities, when the factual record substantiated he had an account in his name and email address.<sup>2</sup>

## **II. PARTIES' AGREEMENTS OF FINDINGS OF FACT, VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION AND VIOLATION LEVELS**

### **1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 10.01.1 and 10.3 (2024-25)] (Level I)<sup>3</sup>**

Between November 2024 and January 2025, Williams knowingly provided information to another student-athlete who was engaged in sports betting. Specifically:

- a. On November 9, 2024, prior to San Francisco's men's basketball game against Boise State University, Williams provided information to Robinson to bet on Williams's point totals or three-point shots made (over-line) while discussing different performance options for daily fantasy sports proposition (prop) bets.
- b. On December 5, 2024, prior to San Francisco's men's basketball game against Saint Louis University, Williams provided information to Robinson to bet on Williams's point totals (over-line) while discussing different performance options for daily fantasy sports prop bets.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> The investigation determined that Williams placed bets on professional sports competitions. These violations did not involve any integrity issues. Therefore, consistent with processing of prohibited bettor violations involving student-athletes and pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.1.1, the institution will report the violation to be processed as Level III.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020431

December 10, 2025

Page No. 2

---

- c. On December 15, 2024, prior to San Francisco's men's basketball game against Loyola University Chicago, Williams provided information to Robinson to bet on Williams's point totals (over-line) while discussing different performance options for daily fantasy sports prop bets.
  - d. On December 18, 2024, prior to San Francisco's men's basketball game against Bradley University, Williams provided information to Robinson to bet on Williams's point totals (over-line).
  - e. On December 21, 2024, prior to San Francisco's men's basketball game against the University of Montana, Williams provided information to Robinson to bet on Williams's rebound-assist totals (over-line).
  - f. On January 4, 2025, prior to San Francisco's men's basketball game against Washington State University, Williams provided information to Robinson to bet on Williams's point totals (over-line).
  - g. On January 9, 2025, prior to San Francisco's men's basketball game against the University of Portland, Williams provided information to Robinson to bet on Williams's point totals (over-line).
  - h. On January 11, 2025, prior to San Francisco's men's basketball game against Santa Clara University, Williams provided information to Robinson to bet on Williams's point totals (over-line).
  - i. On January 16, 2025, prior to San Francisco's men's basketball game against Pepperdine University, Williams provided information to Robinson to bet on Williams's point totals (over-line).
2. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 19.2.1, 19.2.1-(c), 19.2.1-(d), 19.2.2, 19.2.2-(a) and 19.2.2-(c) (2024-25)] (Level I)

On March 4, 2025, Williams failed to cooperate with the enforcement staff when he knowingly provided false or misleading information to the enforcement staff regarding his knowledge of and/or involvement in a possible violation of NCAA legislation. Specifically, Williams provided false or misleading information to the enforcement staff when he denied having a daily fantasy sport wagering account while participating as a men's basketball student-athlete. However, the factual record substantiates Williams had an account under his name and email address.

### **III. OTHER VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION SUBSTANTIATED; NOT ALLEGED**

None.

### **IV. REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES**

None.

### **V. OTHER AGREEMENTS**

The parties agree that this case will be processed through the NCAA negotiated resolution process as outlined in Bylaw 19.10, and a hearing panel comprised of members of the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions will review the negotiated resolution. The parties acknowledge that the negotiated resolution contains agreed-upon findings of fact of NCAA violations. 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.

The parties acknowledge that this negotiated resolution may be voidable by the Committee on Infractions if any of the parties were aware or become aware of information that materially alters the factual information on which this negotiated resolution is based.

The parties further acknowledge that 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 parties understand that 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, the parties agree that they waive NCAA hearing and appellate opportunities.

### **VI. 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 agreed-upon facts and violations are appropriate for this process. Pursuant to Bylaw 19.10.6, this resolution has no precedential value.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020431

December 10, 2025

Page No. 4

---

**NCAA COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS PANEL**

Douglas Archie

Jody Conradt

Rich Ensor, chief hearing officer