

## NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION<sup>1</sup>

NCAA Member Institutions – Case No. 020494

May 15, 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, 19.7.5.3 and 19.20.6. Former Abilene Christian University (Abilene Christian) men's basketball student-athlete Airion Simmons (Simmons) is a non-participating party included in the negotiated resolution pursuant to Bylaw 19.10.2.1 and Committee on Infractions Internal Operating Procedure (IOP) 4-7-1-2-2.

On September 19, 2025, an NCAA Division II institution submitted a secondary violation via Requests/Self-Reports Online (RSRO) for sports betting violations involving a former Abilene Christian men's basketball student-athlete (Student-Athlete 1). The Division II institution reported that Student-Athlete 1 informed the head men's basketball coach of sports betting violations when he was a men's basketball student-athlete at Abilene Christian.

Specifically, Student-Athlete 1 reported that on March 20, 2024, prior to the Abilene Christian game against Tarleton State University (Tarleton State), two teammates discussed a way to get paid to lose the game. Student-Athlete 1 reported that the plan was initially proposed while playing a video game with his then teammates, Simmons and Student-Athlete No. 2. Student-Athlete 1 stated that all the participants in the video game pressured him to go along with the plan.

Shortly after the video game ended, Student-Athlete 1 reported receiving an incoming Facetime call that included Simmons, Student-Athlete 2 and a known bettor (Known Bettor 1).<sup>2</sup> Known Bettor 1 told Simmons, Student-Athlete 1 and Student-Athlete 2 to lose the game to make money. Student-Athlete 1 reported feeling pressured by the others on the call and agreed to participate in the plan to lose. Student-Athlete 1 stated the outcome was already determined by the time he entered the game and his performance had no impact.

On December 2, 2025, the enforcement staff interviewed Simmons, who reported another known bettor (Known Bettor 2) sent him a direct message to connect prior to the Tarlton State game.<sup>3</sup> Simmons provided his phone number, and Known Bettor 2 and someone else who Simmons did not know called Simmons on Facetime. Known Bettor 2 and the other individual asked Simmons if he wanted to make some quick money to lose the game. Simmons told them he

---

<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> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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. 020494

May 15, 2026

Page No. 2

---

was struggling with a hand injury and his status for the game was unclear. Simmons also shared that another teammate would not be playing in the game. Known Bettor 2 offered Simmons \$3500 to “play bad” in the game. Simmons injured his hand early in the game and did not return after only playing 11 minutes.

Simmons reported meeting someone in a parking lot at an outlet mall in Dallas, Texas, to get cash for his participation in throwing the game. Known Bettor 2 instructed Simmons where to go and the type of car the payer would be driving. Neither Known Bettor 2 nor the other person on the Facetime calls were present when Simmons received the cash. Simmons reported he kept all of the cash and did not pay Student-Athlete 1 or Student-Athlete 2.

On January 14, 2026, Simmons was 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 for his involvement in the events surrounding the game against Tarleton State.

## **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)]<sup>4</sup>**

On March 20, 2024, Simmons violated the principles of NCAA honesty and sportsmanship when he knowingly provided information to individuals involved in sports wagering activities and agreed to manipulate his performance during one Abilene Christian men’s basketball game to financially benefit himself and others. Specifically, on March 20, 2024, before the institution’s game versus Tarleton State, Simmons 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, Simmons and select Abilene Christian 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 Simmons was paid \$3,500 for his participation.

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

None.

---

<sup>4</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. 020494

May 15, 2026

Page No. 3

---

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

None.

### **V. PARTIES TO THE CASE**

Simmons declined to participate in the resolution of the case.

### **VI. AGREEMENTS<sup>5</sup>**

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.
- 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.

---

<sup>5</sup> 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. 020494

May 15, 2026

Page No. 4

---

**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**

Rich Ensor, chief hearing officer

Jason Leonard

Amy Parsons