

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION¹

NCAA Member Institutions – Case No. 020353

November 21, 2025

I. CASE SYNOPSIS

Former Temple University (Temple) men's basketball student-athlete Hysier Miller (Miller) and the NCAA enforcement staff agree with the violations.

On March 7, 2024, a sports integrity monitoring service notified the enforcement staff that there was suspicious sports wagering line activity concerning Temple's men's basketball game versus the University of Alabama-Birmingham.

On March 19, 2024, Temple and the enforcement staff began a collaborative investigation that determined Miller participated in impermissible sports betting activity. Specifically, from November 7, 2022, through March 2, 2024, Miller placed 39 impermissible sportsbook bets on and three bets against Temple men's basketball, totaling approximately \$473. Miller's bets on Temple men's basketball games were always part of parlay bets which included games being played by other teams. Miller never placed a stand-alone bet on the outcome of a Temple men's basketball game. Miller's bets involved various parlays on 23 different Temple games using sportsbook accounts belonging to other people.

On October 10, 2024, Miller interviewed with the enforcement staff and admitted to placing parlay bets on Temple men's basketball games. Miller did not recall placing any bets against Temple men's basketball games or the number of bets placed on Temple's contests.

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

1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 10.01.1 and 10.3 (2022-23 and 2023-2024)] (Level I)²

From November 2022 through March 2024, Miller violated the principles of NCAA honesty and sportsmanship when he knowingly participated in personal sports wagering activities, including activities related to his own team in an intercollegiate competition, to financially benefit

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 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 NCAA Bylaw 19.1.1.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020353

November 21, 2025

Page No. 2

himself.³ Specifically, Miller placed 39 sportsbook bets on and three bets against Temple men's basketball contests as part of various parlay wagers totaling \$473.

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.

³ The investigation determined that Miller placed bets on professional and collegiate sports competitions, in addition to his own basketball team. These other 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.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Case No. 020353

November 21, 2025

Page No. 3

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.

NCAA COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS PANEL

Joshua Gordon

Kendra Greene

Jason Leonard, chief hearing officer