

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION¹

NCAA Member Institutions – Case No. 020488

June 5, 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 Alabama State University (Alabama State) men's basketball student-athlete Amarr Knox (Knox) agrees with the violation in which he is named below. Former Alabama State men's basketball student-athletes Shawn Fulcher (Fulcher), Corey Hines (Hines) and Tony Madlock (Madlock) are non-participating parties.

On July 31, 2025, Temple University (Temple) informed the enforcement staff that Hines was contacted by the FBI and shown text messages concerning a sports integrity issue when he was a student-athlete at Alabama State.² Temple and the enforcement staff then requested an interview with Hines, who initially declined.

On October 20, 2025, and January 9, 2026, the enforcement staff interviewed Knox, who reported that Fulcher put other teammates in a group chat with Known Bettor 1 on December 4, 2024.³ Known Bettor 1 offered money for the team to throw the institution's game against the University of Southern Mississippi (Southern Mississippi) on December 5, 2024.⁴ Knox's teammates, including Fulcher, Hines and Madlock, then participated in a Facetime call the morning of the game with Known Bettor 1. Madlock told the bettor that he was injured and not going to play that night. The group agreed on the Facetime call to throw the game. After the game, the teammates talked about whether they would get paid and when Known Bettor 1 would travel to Montgomery, Alabama. Known Bettor 1 did not respond to Fulcher and Knox, who tried to call him about getting paid.

Knox reported that he and Fulcher, Hines and Madlock received a total of \$2,000 for throwing Alabama State's game against Southern Mississippi. Known Bettor 2 made the payment to the student-athletes.⁵ Fulcher and Madlock each received \$700 because the bettors were Fulcher's contacts and he communicated with them, and Madlock provided information to the bettors that he was not going to play in the game. Hines and Knox each received \$300.

The enforcement staff interviewed Fulcher who provided false or misleading information when he denied 1) participating in a call and sharing betting information with individuals who were engaged in

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 Hines transferred to Temple University for the 2025-26 season.

³ Knox transferred to Eastern Kentucky University for the 2025-26 season.

⁴ Known Bettor 1 was indicted 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.

⁵ Known Bettor 2 was indicted 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.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020488

June 5, 2026

Page No. 2

sports wagering activity and 2) personally betting on sports.⁶ The factual record substantiated that he was paid for participating in a call and providing information to an individual who was engaged in sports wagering activity and wagered on sports through a daily fantasy site.⁷

On January 9, 2026, Hines' attorney notified the enforcement staff that Hines wanted to participate in an interview. During his subsequent interview, Hines provided false or misleading information when he denied participating in a call and sharing betting information with individuals who were engaged in sports wagering activity. The factual record substantiated that he was paid for participating in a call and providing information to an individual who was engaged in sports wagering activity. After the interview, the enforcement staff requested text records from Hines, who did not respond.

Madlock declined to participate in an interview with the enforcement staff.

On January 14, 2026, Fulcher and Hines were indicted by the Eastern District of Pennsylvania on various fraud charges, including bribery in sports wagering contests, wire fraud and conspiracy to commit wire fraud concerning their involvement in events surrounding the Southern Mississippi contest.

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

1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 10.01.1 and 10.3 (2024-25)]⁸ (Level I)

On December 5, 2024, Knox violated the principles of NCAA honesty and sportsmanship when he underperformed during one Alabama State men's basketball game to financially benefit himself and others. Specifically, on December 5, 2024, Knox and select Alabama State men's basketball student-athletes conspired and agreed to lose or attempt to lose by more points than the betting spread identified by sports book operators in a game against Southern Mississippi. Later in December, Knox and select teammates were paid \$2,000.

2. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 10.01.1 and 10.3 (2024-25)]⁹ (Level I)

On December 5, 2024, Hines violated the principles of NCAA honesty and sportsmanship when he knowingly provided information to individuals involved in sports wagering activities and agreed to underperform during one Alabama State men's basketball game to financially benefit himself and others. Specifically, on December 5, 2024, before the

⁶ Fulcher transferred to the University of New Mexico Highlands for the 2025-26 season.

⁷ Because a student-athlete (and not a current or former institutional staff member) committed the violation 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.

⁸ Because a student-athlete (and not a current or former institutional staff member) committed the violation 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.

⁹ Because a student-athlete (and not a current or former institutional staff member) committed the violation 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. 020488

June 5, 2026

Page No. 3

institution's game versus Southern Mississippi, Hines provided information to individuals that the institution would lose by more points than the betting spread identified by sports book operators, in a conspiracy with outside bettors for pecuniary gain. In addition, Hines and select Alabama State men's basketball student-athletes agreed to lose or attempt to lose by more points than the betting spread identified by sports book operators and were paid \$2,000.

3. [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), 19.2.2-(b) and 19.2.2-(c) (2025-26)] (Level I)

Beginning August 2, 2025, and continuing to the present, Hines failed to cooperate when he refused to participate in an interview, knowingly provided false or misleading information to the enforcement staff and refused to produce text records relevant to the investigation. Specifically:

- a. From August 2, 2025, to January 13, 2026, Hines failed to cooperate when he refused to participate in an interview. Specifically, on August 2, 2025, the enforcement staff requested an interview with Hines regarding potential sports betting integrity issues while he was a student-athlete at Alabama State. On October 30, 2025, Hines notified the enforcement staff he would not participate in the enforcement staff's investigation. [NCAA Bylaws 19.2.1, 19.2.1-(c), 19.2.1-(d), 19.2.2, 19.2.2-(a) and 19.2.2-(b) (2025-26)]
 - b. On January 14, 2026, Hines agreed to participate in an interview but failed to cooperate when he provided false or misleading information to the enforcement staff by denying having knowledge of or being involved in any plan to underperform before the institution's December 5, 2024, contest against Southern Mississippi. However, the factual record substantiates that Hines provided information to an individual who was engaged in sports wagering activities, agreed to underperform and was paid \$300 for his part in losing 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)(205-26)]
 - c. On January 14, 2026, the enforcement staff requested text records from Hines who did not respond. Hines' failure to cooperate with the requests has continued to the present. [NCAA Bylaws 19.2.1, 19.2.1-(c), 19.2.1-(e), 19.2.2, 19.2.2-(a) and 19.2.2-(b) (2025-26)]
4. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 10.01.1 and 10.3 (2024-25)]¹⁰ (Level I)

On December 5, 2024, Fulcher violated the principles of NCAA honesty and sportsmanship when he knowingly provided information to individuals involved in sports wagering activities and agreed to underperform during one Alabama State men's basketball

¹⁰ Because a student-athlete (and not a current or former institutional staff member) committed the violation 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. 020488

June 5, 2026

Page No. 4

game to financially benefit himself and others.¹¹ Specifically, on December 5, 2024, before the institution's game versus Southern Mississippi, Fulcher provided information to individuals that the institution would lose by more points than the betting spread identified by sports book operators, in a conspiracy with outside bettors for pecuniary gain. In addition, Fulcher and select Alabama State men's basketball student-athletes agreed to lose or attempt to lose by more points than the betting spread identified by sports book operators and were paid \$2,000.

5. [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) (2025-26)] (Level I)

On October 24, 2025, Fulcher failed to cooperate when he knowingly provided false or misleading information to the enforcement staff. Specifically, Fulcher provided false or misleading information to the enforcement staff when he denied having knowledge of or being involved in any plan to underperform before the institution's December 5, 2024, contest against Southern Mississippi. However, the factual record substantiates that Fulcher provided information to an individual who was engaged in sports wagering activities, conspired with teammates to underperform and was paid \$700 for his part in losing the game.

6. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 10.01.1 and 10.3 (2024-25)]¹² (Level I)

On December 5, 2024, Madlock violated the principles of NCAA honesty and sportsmanship when he knowingly provided information to individuals involved in sports wagering activities during one Alabama State men's basketball game to financially benefit himself and others. Specifically, on December 5, 2024, before the institution's game versus Southern Mississippi, Madlock provided information to individuals that the institution would lose by more points than the betting spread identified by sports book operators, in a conspiracy with outside bettors for pecuniary gain. Later in December, Madlock and select teammates were paid \$2,000.

III. OTHER VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION SUBSTANTIATED; NOT ALLEGED

None.

¹¹ The investigation determined that Fulcher placed bets on professional and collegiate sports competitions. These 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 violation to be processed Level III pursuant to Bylaw 19.1.1.

¹² Because a student-athlete (and not a current or former institutional staff member) committed the violation 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.

IV. REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES

None.

V. PARTIES TO THE CASE

A. Party to the negotiated resolution.

Knox.

B. Not participating in the case.

Fulcher, Hines and Madlock.

VI. OTHER AGREEMENTS¹³

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 parties 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 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.

¹³ 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. 020488

June 5, 2026

Page No. 6

- 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

Susan Lipnickey

Steve Waterfield, chief hearing officer