

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION¹

NCAA Member Institutions – Case No. 020430

November 7, 2025

I. CASE SYNOPSIS

Former Arizona State University (Arizona State) men's basketball student-athlete Chatton Freeman (Freeman) 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 evidence that on at least four occasions, Freeman knowingly provided information to Robinson, who was wagering on Freeman through daily fantasy sports accounts.² Freeman also knowingly provided information on at least two occasions to his then girlfriend, who was wagering on Freeman through a daily fantasy sports account. Freeman did not encourage or direct Robinson to place the bets.

Freeman, who has one year of eligibility remaining, participated in interviews with the enforcement staff March 18 and July 31, 2025. During the interviews, Freeman provided false or misleading information when he denied sharing betting information with Robinson and his then girlfriend, who were engaged in sports wagering activity, when the factual record substantiated he provided information. Freeman also provided false or misleading information to the enforcement staff 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 and that he made monetary deposits into the account at a previous institution.³

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)] (Level I)⁴

Between November 2024 and January 2025, Freeman knowingly provided information to another student-athlete and Freeman's then girlfriend who were engaged in sports wagering. Specifically:

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 Robinson's involvement in impermissible sports betting activity was adjudicated through a separate NR. *See California State University, Fresno (Mykell Robinson)* (2025).

³ The investigation determined that, while a men's basketball student-athlete at a different NCAA Division I institution and prior to his enrollment at Arizona State, Freeman 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, Freeman's prior institution will report the violation to be processed as Level III.

⁴ 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. 020430

November 7, 2025

Page No. 2

- a. On November 28, 2024, prior to Arizona State's men's basketball game against the University of New Mexico (New Mexico), Freeman provided information to Robinson to bet on Freeman's point totals (over-line) while discussing different performance options for daily fantasy sports proposition (prop) bets.
 - b. On November 29, 2024, prior to Arizona State's men's basketball game against Saint Mary's College of California, Freeman provided information to Robinson to bet on Freeman's point totals (over-line) while discussing different performance options for daily fantasy sports prop bets.
 - c. On December 14, 2024, prior to Arizona State men's basketball game against the University of Florida (Florida), Freeman provided information to Robinson to bet on Freeman's turnover totals (over-line) while discussing different performance options for daily fantasy sports prop bets.
 - d. On December 31, 2024, prior to Arizona State men's basketball game against Brigham Young University and Fresno State's men's basketball game against New Mexico, Freeman provided information to Robinson to bet on Freeman's point totals (over-line) as part of a three-leg parlay that included a three-pointers-made total (over-line) for Robinson and an assist total (over-line) for another men's basketball student-athlete at Fresno State. Freeman also provided this information to his then girlfriend to place the same bet.
 - e. On January 4, 2025, prior to Arizona State men's basketball game against Florida and the University of San Francisco (San Francisco) men's basketball game against the University of Colorado, Freeman provided information to his then girlfriend to place two bets on Freeman's point totals (over-line) as part of a two-leg parlay that included a point total (over-line) for one men's basketball student-athlete at San Francisco and a three-leg parlay that included a point total (over-line) and a three-pointers-made total (over-line) for two other men's basketball student-athletes at San Francisco.
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 18 and July 31, 2025, Freeman 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:

- a. On March 18, Freeman provided false or misleading information to the enforcement staff when he denied sharing information with Robinson for the purposes of sports wagering activity. However, the factual record substantiates that

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020430

November 7, 2025

Page No. 3

Freeman provided information to Robinson, who was engaged in sports wagering activities.

- b. On March 18 and July 31, Freeman provided false or misleading information to the enforcement staff when he denied having a daily fantasy sport wagering account while previously participating as a men's basketball student-athlete at another NCAA institution. However, the factual record substantiates Freeman had an account under his name and email address and made monetary deposits into the account.
- c. On July 31, Freeman provided false or misleading information to the enforcement staff when he denied sharing information with his then girlfriend for the purposes of sports wagering activity. However, the factual record substantiates that Freeman provided information to Freeman's then girlfriend who was engaged in sports wagering activity.

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.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020430

November 7, 2025

Page No. 4

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.

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 agreed-upon 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

Tricia Turley Brandenburg

Susan Lipnickey, chief hearing officer

Christian Spears