

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION¹

NCAA Member Institutions – Case No. 020416

March 6, 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 North Carolina A&T State University (North Carolina A&T) men's basketball student-athletes Ryan Forrest (Forrest) and Landon Glasper (Glasper) are non-participating parties.

On December 8, 2025, North Carolina A&T reported prohibited bettor sports betting violations by a then assistant men's basketball coach to the enforcement staff.² While working with the institution on that issue, the enforcement staff received information from NCAA integrity partners and Tennessee sports betting regulators about suspicious betting activity related to four North Carolina A&T games between December 17, 2024, and January 23, 2025.

On February 10, 2025, the enforcement staff interviewed Forrest, Glasper and three other North Carolina A&T student-athletes. The enforcement staff also imaged the student-athletes' phones.³ Text messages from Forrest's phone revealed pictures of Forrest with large amounts of cash around the time of the games under suspicion. Forrest's phone also contained a substantial number of group text messages that included screenshots of bet slips on NFL and NBA games. Further, Forrest's roommate reported law enforcement visited their apartment on or about April 7, 2025, wanting to speak with Forrest.

Glasper entered the transfer portal March 24, 2025, and eventually matriculated to The University of Southern Mississippi (Southern Mississippi) for the fall of 2025. On October 30, 2025, Glasper left Southern Mississippi and is currently playing in Serbia. Forrest entered the transfer portal April 23, 2025, and has not matriculated anywhere.

Based on the data recovered from student-athletes' phones and North Carolina A&T's report of an FBI inquiry, the enforcement staff requested financial records and additional interviews with Forrest and Glasper in April and May 2025. The enforcement staff initially coordinated those requests through North Carolina A&T's compliance staff and outside counsel, and both Glasper and Forrest ignored the institution's requests.

On July 1, 2025, the enforcement staff emailed Forrest and Glasper to request bank, Cash App and Apple Pay records from September 2024 through March 2025. The staff also requested second interviews with Forrest and Glasper but neither responded to any of the requests.

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 The student-athletes took several months to respond to requests from the enforcement staff's phone imaging vendor to review their phone data, which created additional delays in the investigation.

³ The assistant coach's prohibited bettor violations were not related to the integrity investigation, and the institution reported the violations as Level III.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020416

March 6, 2026

Page No. 2

On September 11, 2025, the staff emailed Forrest and Glasper to renew the requests. That day, Forrest responded that he was not interested in participating in an interview. During the next month, Glasper produced some of the requested records. The following timeline details Glasper's communication with the enforcement staff.

- September 23, 2025 – Glasper responded and requested a call to discuss the status of the case.
- September 26, 2025 – The enforcement staff spoke with Glasper about the status of the investigation.
- October 2, 2025 – Glasper provided some of the requested financial records.
- October 7, 2025 – The enforcement staff requested Glasper produce the remaining documents.
- October 9, 2025 – Glasper emailed some additional records.
- October 14, 2025 – The enforcement staff again requested Glasper provide the missing documents. Glasper did not respond.
- October 29, 2025 – The enforcement staff made a final request for Glasper's outstanding documents. Glasper never responded.

To date, neither Forrest nor Glasper have participated in a second interview or produced all the requested documents. Further, Forrest and Glasper failed to respond to the enforcement staff's requests regarding processing this case. Specifically, on December 19, 2025, the enforcement staff provided information for Forrest and Glasper to gain access to the draft allegations. Initially, Forrest did not respond. When the enforcement staff followed up via email on January 12, 2026, Forrest signed the confidentiality agreement to view the draft allegations. The staff shared the draft allegations with Forrest and requested a response regarding his resolution preference by January 19, 2026. Forrest did not respond. Glasper has not responded to emails from the enforcement staff since the staff first notified him November 17, 2025, of its allegation review board regarding this case or follow up emails regarding the draft allegations. Therefore, Forrest and Glasper are considered non-participating parties.

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) (2024-25 and 2025-26)] (Level I)

From April 2025 and continuing to the present, then North Carolina A&T men's basketball student-athlete Forrest failed to cooperate when he refused to produce requested documents and participate in a second interview with the enforcement staff. Specifically, on April 11, 22 and May 1, the enforcement staff, through North Carolina A&T's counsel, requested Forrest produce certain financial records and participate in a second interview regarding potential sports betting integrity issues. Forrest did not

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020416

March 6, 2026

Page No. 3

respond to the requests from the institution, and on July 1 and September 11, the enforcement staff renewed these requests directly to Forrest. On September 11, Forrest notified the enforcement staff he would not participate in the enforcement staff's investigation.

2. [NCAA Division I Manual 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)] (Level I)

From October 7, 2025, and continuing to the present, then Southern Mississippi men's basketball student-athlete Glasper failed to cooperate when he refused to produce requested documents.⁴ Specifically, on October 7 and 14, 2025, the enforcement staff requested financial records from Glasper regarding potential sports betting integrity issues while he was a student-athlete at North Carolina A&T.⁵ Glasper did not respond. October 29, 2025, the enforcement staff informed Glasper it would pursue a failure to cooperate allegation if the documents were not produced by November 3. Glasper again did not respond.

III. OTHER VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION SUBSTANTIATED; NOT ALLEGED

None.

IV. REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES

None.

V. PARTIES TO THE CASE

Forrest declined to participate in the resolution of this case and Glasper has been nonresponsive.

⁴ Based on the uncontested facts, it appears that Glasper's failure to participate in a second interview with the enforcement staff could have been cited as part of the basis for his failure to cooperate violation. *See* Bylaw 19.2.1-(d). However, the panel recognizes that this addition would not have a material impact on the level of the violation. The panel defers to the enforcement staff's charging decision.

⁵ After transferring from North Carolina A&T State, Glasper became a student-athlete at Southern Mississippi on August 8, 2025.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020416

March 6, 2026

Page No. 4

VI. AGREEMENTS ⁶

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 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.
- 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

Richard Ensor, chief hearing officer
Kay Norton
Maureen Weston

⁶ 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.